Università degli Studi di Padova

Sede Amministrativa: Università degli Studi di Padova
Dipartimento di Matematica

DOTTORATO DI RICERCA IN MATEMATICA
INDIRIZZO: MATEMATICA
CICLO XXVI

On a generalization of affinoid varieties

Direttore della Scuola: Ch.mo Prof. Paolo Dai Pra
Coordinatore d'indirizzo: Ch.mo Prof. Franco Cardin
Supervisore: Ch.mo Prof. Francesco Baldassarri

Dottorando: Federico Bambozzi

Dicembre 2013

arXiv:1401.5702v1 [math.AG] 22 Jan 2014

Contents

0 Introduction **9**

1 Bornological structures **15**
1.1 Bornological sets . . . 15
1.2 Bornological groups . . . 18
1.3 Bornological rings . . . 24
1.3.1 Convexity on bornological rings . . . 26
1.4 Bornological modules . . . 33
1.5 The language of halos . . . 34

2 Bornological spectra and power-series **37**
2.1 Spectra of bornological algebras of convex type . . . 37
2.1.1 Bornological convergence and topologically nilpotent elements . . . 48
2.2 Bornological strictly convergent power-series . . . 50
2.3 The ring of bornological overconvergent power-series . . . 59
2.4 Weak power-bounded elements and algebraic monads . . . 63
2.5 Spectra of locally convex algebras . . . 66

3 Dagger affinoid spaces **71**
3.1 Overconvergent analytic functions on polydisks . . . 71
3.2 The category of dagger affinoid algebras . . . 78
3.3 Complex dagger algebras as **Ind**-Stein algebras . . . 87
3.4 Dagger affinoid spaces . . . 91
3.5 Dagger affinoid subdomains . . . 94

4 Tate's acyclicity for rational dagger subdomains **99**

5 The Gerritzen-Grauert theorem **105**
5.1 Archimedean subdomains . . . 105
5.2 The Gerritzen-Grauert theorem . . . 113

6 Dagger analytic spaces over a valued field **121**
6.1 Coherent sheaves over a dagger affinoid space . . . 121
6.2 Dagger analytic spaces . . . 132
6.3 Sheaves over dagger analytic spaces . . . 140
6.4 Relations with classical analytic geometries . . . 146
6.4.1 Non-archimedean case . . . 146
6.4.2 Complex analytic case . . . 156
6.4.3 The GAGA principle . . . 158

A The pro-site **161**
A.1 Pro-objects and Ind-objects 161
A.2 The pro-site and pro-analytic spaces 163

B Generalized rings of Durov **167**
B.1 Monads given by multiplicative submonoids of rings 170

C The bornology of coefficientwise convergence **173**

Abstract

In this thesis we develop the foundations for a theory of analytic geometry over a valued field, uniformly encompassing the case when the base field is equipped with a non-archimedean valuation and the case when it has an archimedean one. We will use the efficient language of bornological algebras to reach this goal. Since, at our knowledge, there is not a strong literature on bornological algebras on which we can base our results, we need to start from scratch with theory of bornological algebras and we develop it as far as we need for our scope. In this way we can construct our theory of analytic spaces taking as building blocks affinoid dagger algebras, *i.e.* bornological algebras isomorphic to quotients of the algebras of germs of analytic functions on polycylinders. It turns out that we can show for the category of dagger affinoid algebras the analogous of all the main results of the category of affinoid algebras and hence we obtain a good theory of dagger affinoid spaces, which behave very similarly to affinoid spaces used to construct rigid analytic spaces. We underline that the archimedean case has special features that we study in the first section of the fifth chapter, and that these special properties enable us to prove the generalization, in archimedean context, of the main result of affinoid algebras theory: the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem (we remark that our proof is inspired by the new proof of Gerritzen-Grauert theorem in Berkovich geometry given by Temkin, [31]).

With a good affine theory at our disposal we end this thesis by constructing the global theory of dagger analytic spaces. We use the theory of Berkovich nets and hence a Berkovich-like approach to the globalization, as done in [30]. In this way we obtain the category of dagger analytic spaces and we study the relations of the spaces we found with the ones already present in literature. In particular we see that our spaces are very strongly related to dagger spaces of Grosse-Klönne, [33], and that, in the archimedean case, the category of classical complex analytic spaces embeds fully faithfully in the category of complex dagger analytic spaces.

In conclusion, in this work we obtain a complete affinoid theory of dagger spaces over any valued field and we show that on this theory can be developed a good theory of dagger analytic spaces, which deserves to be strengthened in the future.

Riassunto

In questa tesi viengono sviluppate le basi per una teoreia degli spazi analitici su campi valutati che comprende in modo uniforme il caso in cui il campo base sia archimedeo o non-archimedeo. Per raggiungere questo obiettivo useremo il linguaggio efficiente delle algebre bornologiche. Siccome non sembra essere disponibile una amplia letteratura riguardo le algebre bornologiche, le prima parte della tesi si occupa di stabilire alcuni risultati fondamentali a riguardo. Con questi risultati a disposizione, è possibile costruire una teoria degli spazi analitici prendendo come mattoni fondamentali le algebre dagger affinoidi, *i.e.* algebre bornologiche isomorfe a quozienti delle algebre dei germi di funzioni analitiche su policilindri. Si ottiene quindi che la categoria delle algebra affinoidi dagger cos definite soddisfa l'analogo di tutte le proprietà più importanti della categoria delle algebre affinoidi e che quindi otteniamo una buona teoria degli spazi affinoidi dagger che è del tutto analoga alla categoria degli spazi affinoidi usati in geometria rigida. C'è da sottolineare che il caso in cui il campo base è archimedeo ha proprietà perticolari, studiate all'inizio del quinto capitolo, e che queste proprietà permettono di ottenere anche per spazi affinodi dagger archimedei il principale risultato strutturale della teoria delle algebre affinoidi: il teorema di Gerritzen-Grauert (la dimostrazione qui data di questo teorema è ispirata dalla nuova dimostrazione data da Temkin in [31] valida in geometria di Berkovich).

Dopo aver ottenuto una buona teoria affine la tesi si conclude con la costruzione della teoria globale degli spazi analitici dagger. Verrà utilizzato un approccio analogo a quello usato da Berkovich in [30] per fare questo. Dopo aver definito questa nuova categoria di spazi verranno studiate le relazioni tra questi e gli spazi analitici presenti in letteratura. In particolare si vedrà che questi spazi sono fortemente legati agli spazi dagger di Grosse-Klönne e che nel caso archimedeo la categoria degli spazi analitici complessi classica si immerge in modo pienamente fedele nella categoria degli spazi analiti dagger complessi.

In conclusione, in questo lavoro si ottiene una teoria affinoide completa per spazi dagger su ogni campo valutato sulla base della quale viene proposta una teoria degli spazi dagger globali la quale dovrà essere approfondita in futuro.

Acknowledgements

My utmost gratitude goes to my advisor, prof. Francesco Baldassarri who gave the fascinating of the topic of my thesis. It has been an honour and pleasure to work with him, and it was not possible for me to do this thesis without the useful discussions that we had during the three years of my Ph.D.

A special thanks goes to Velibor Bojkovic for his help in checking arguments of proves on earlier version of this paper and the help he gave me in order to understand Berkovich geometry.

Finally, I want to thank the referees, Oren Ben-Bassat and Elmar Grosse-Klönne, for their comments (especially the critics of Elmar which spurred me to give a better form and presentation to the text) and their encouragements without which I probably didn't have the force to finish the last chapter in time for the bureaucratic deadlines.

Chapter 0

Introduction

The aim of this work is to build the foundations for a theory of analytic geometry over a valued field, uniformly encompassing the case when the base field is equipped with a non-archimedean valuation and the case when it has an archimedean one. The main ingredients to reach the goal, in what we think is the easiest and smoothest way, are the dagger algebras (or algebras of germs of analytic functions), analogous to the dagger algebras defined by Grosse-Klönne [33], and the theory of bornological vector spaces.

Historically, one of the first attempts to develop in a systematic way a theory of analytic spaces over non-archimedean valued fields, in particular analytic manifolds over such fields, was made by Serre in his notes on Lie algebras and Lie groups, [52]. The idea was to mimic the theory of analytic spaces over the field of complex number, but it soon be clear that this point of view didn't give a the expected results due to the pathological topology which fields are endowed by non-archimedean valuations. Then, the new approach of John Tate, first published in [25], overcame these problems with new and highly original ideas. This new theory has the power to have its own version of a big part of the main results of complex analytic spaces theory and also it turned out to be very useful for solving some problems in arithmetic geometry, and is now a fundamental tool for any arithmetic geometer. But beside this good features, the theory of rigid analytic spaces introduces an awkward asymmetry between two theories, archimedean analytic and non-archimedean analytic geometry, which starting from (seeming) very different ingredients and different technique arrive to to work out two parallel theories. In this work we will see that to an accurate inspection these differences can be made to disappear using germs of analytic functions on polydisks instead of affinoid algebras.

Let's see in detail the contents of the various chapters. In the first chapter we introduce the concept of a bornology on a set: a bornology on a set X is a collection of subsets $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathscr{P}(X)$ which is an ideal of the boolean algebra $\mathscr{P}(X)$ and covers X, definition 1.1.1. We will give to the class of bornological sets a structure of a category defining bounded maps as the set-theoretical functions which map all the bounded sets of the domain to bounded sets of the codomain. Then we study basic properties of algebraic bornological structures: bornological groups, bornological rings and bornological modules which we define as algebraic structures over bornological sets for which is required that the structural maps are bounded maps. The main results of this chapter are the proof that the category of abelian bornological groups is a quasi-abelian category (proposition 1.2.10), generalizing the result of Prosman and Schneiders given in [21] for bornological vector spaces over $\mathbb{C}$, and the introduction of the notion of convexity over bornological rings and modules (definition 1.3.6). To do this we attach to the submonoid of power-bounded elements $A^\circ \subset A$ of a bornological ring a set $\mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ) \subset A^n$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with a structure of a cosimplicial complex, which encodes the information of how the monoid A° is embedded in A. It turns out that this

object is a particular case of "generalized ring" studied by Durov in his thesis [45]. In this context absolutely convex subsets of an A-module are interpreted as Σ_{A°-submodules (where Σ_{A° is the monad, *i.e.* the generalized ring, that we canonically associate to the immersion $A^\circ \hookrightarrow A$) in total analogy with non-archimedean analysis where a subset of a k-vector space is called absolutely convex if it is a k°-module. It seems that this "generalized ring" is a more interesting object to study than simply A° if one wants to develop, for example, a theory of formal models for archimedean dagger spaces. And so following this idea we will give the definition of strongly bounded morphisms which seems to be of more geometrical nature than bare boundedness. We end this chapter by recalling the basic definitions of Halos theory, as developed by Paugam, but we will use it only as trick in notation, *i.e.* only to have a way to express better our formulas. No result from [47] will be used.

In the second chapter we develop the tools needed to construct our dagger algebras. We start by recalling the definition of the adjoint pair of functors ^{b} and ^{t}, given in [19] and their basic properties. The functor ^{b} goes from the category of locally convex topological vector spaces over a non-trivially valued field to the category of bornological vector spaces of convex type, while ^{t} goes in the other direction. These functors are the classical well known construction called the canonical or Von Neumann bornology, for the functor ^{b}, and the topology of bornivorous sets, for the functor ^{t}. Then, we focus on what we call complete bornological algebras A, definition 2.1.15, over a complete valued field which is the more interesting type of bornological algebra for us, since dagger algebras will be of this kind. We define the bornological spectrum $\mathcal{M}(A)$ of a bornological algebra A using a Berkovich-like approach: points of the spectrum are equivalence classes of bounded characters from A to a complete valued field or equivalently bounded multiplicative seminorms, definition 2.1.17. We underline that our definition agrees with Berkovich definition only for k-algebras (k valued field), not over any ring because we can only use the bornological notion of boundedness of maps which don't always agree with the classical definition over seminormed rings (remark 2.1.19 give an example of this failure).

The association $A \mapsto \mathcal{M}(A)$ is not a good operation if it is considered over the full category of bornological algebras over k, these algebras are too much general to expect this. We give a precise structural property for A, which guarantees that $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is functorially associated to A and is a non-empty compact Hausdorff topological space, theorem 2.1.24. We call this algebras *bornological algebras with well defined spectrum*. After that, we define the ring of bornological strictly convergent power-series $A\langle X\rangle$ for any bornological algebra with well defined spectrum (definition 2.2.6) and we show results analogous to the classical theory for normed algebras:

- $A\langle X\rangle$ has well defined spectrum, theorem 2.2.8;
- if A is complete then also $A\langle X\rangle$ is complete, again 2.2.8;
- $A[X] \subset A\langle X\rangle \subset A[\![X]\!]$ (2.2.8) and moreover $A[X]$ is bornologically dense in $A\langle X\rangle$, *i.e.* the bornological closure of $A[X]$ in $A\langle X\rangle$ is equal to all $A\langle X\rangle$, theorem 2.2.9;
- then the main property: $A\langle X\rangle$ satisfies the "right" universal property in the category of bornological algebras with well defined spectrum: for every bounded morphism of algebras $\phi : A \to B$, with B complete, and any power-bounded element $b \in B^\circ$ there exists a unique bounded morphism $\Phi : A\langle X\rangle \to B$ such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = b$, 2.2.14.

Then we introduce the ring of bornological overconvergent power-series $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$, and analogous results are proved. We underline that to correctly express the universal property characterising $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ we introduce the notion of weakly power-bounded elements of a bornological algebra and $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ will satisfy the same universal property of $A\langle X\rangle$ providing

to substitute the concept of power-bounded element with the concept of weakly power-bounded element. In this way we can state the universal property which characterize dagger algebras, and in particular the algebra of overconvergent analytic functions on the polydisk of polyradius 1, in a more satisfying way than what is done in [33], inserting it in the theory of complete bornological algebras. Moreover, if A is a regular bornological algebra (definition 2.4.5) the weakly power-bounded elements coincide with the power-bounded elements of A equipped with its spectral seminorm (definition 2.1.31), with respect to which A is not a complete k-algebra. Hence, the concept of weakly power-bounded elements permits us to study some kind of non-complete normed algebras as if they were complete (as they are with respect to a weaker notion of completeness). We end this chapter by showing the functoriality property of the map $A \mapsto \Sigma_{A^\diamond}$ which associates to a regular bornological algebra the algebraic monad associated to the submonoid of weakly power-bounded elements and then studying the relations of the classical notion of spectra on topological k-algebras with the bornological spectrum we introduced.

In the next chapter we start to study affinoid dagger algebras, affinoid dagger spaces and dagger affinoid subdomains. We introduce the ring of overconvergent analytic functions over the polydisk of polyradius 1 as the bornological algebra

$$W_k^n \doteq k\langle X_1, \dots, X_n\rangle^\dagger \doteq \varinjlim_{\rho>1} T_k^n(\rho)$$

where k is a fixed complete valued field, ρ is a polyradius bigger than $(1, \dots, 1)$ *i.e.* every component is strictly bigger than 1 and $T_k^n(\rho)$ is the algebra of summable power-series in the polydisk of polyradius ρ (see the first paragraph of the third chapter for the definition of $T_k^n(\rho)$ and the last section of the first chapter for our conventions on summations), and we equip W_k^n with the direct limit bornology. We then recall and discuss some property of $k\langle X_1, \dots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$: the fact that is a Noetherian, factorial domain and a regular LF-space, theorem 3.1.5. The LF-regularity in particular has the important consequence that the open mapping theorem for LF-spaces will have its bornological version in the category of dagger algebras: *i.e.* every surjective morphism between dagger algebras is strict, corollary 3.2.4. The proof of the LF-regularity of the dagger algebras will also have other nice implications: nuclearity, reflexivity, separatedness and completeness with respect to the LF topology. Then, the main result of the first section is the fact that any ideal $I \subset W_k^n$ is bornologically closed, theorem 3.1.12. We underline that it is usual to meet this property in the theory of affinoid algebras, but this doesn't have an immediate archimedean analog: for example is known that every $\mathbb{R}$-Banach algebra for which all principal ideals are closed must be a division algebra. Hence every Banach algebra $k\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, \dots, \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle$ has non-closed ideals and also non-finitely generated ideals: it's known that every Noetherian $\mathbb{C}$-Banach algebra must be finite dimensional as $\mathbb{C}$-vector space. So, at first sight it can be seen as a strange result the fact that all ideals of $k\langle X_1, \dots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ are closed. But it is reasonable once one notice the bornological isomorphism $\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots, X_n\rangle^\dagger \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}(\rho^-))$ (where $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}(\rho^-))$ is the Stein algebra of holomorphic functions in the open polycylinder $\mathbb{D}(\rho^-)$), and in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}(\rho^-))$, with its canonical structure of Fréchet algebra, all finitely generated ideals are closed (we study in details this isomorphism in the third section of the third chapter). We also notice that W_k^n is a good candidate for what we are looking for, because the universal property characterizing W_k^n is the same for any k, archimedean or not, fixing the asymmetry that one finds by the lacking of an archimedean analog of affinoid algebras theory (see remark 3.3.3 for a precise discussion of this topic). Coming back to the second section of the third chapter, we define the category of dagger algebras as the subcategory of the category of bornological algebras which are isomorphic to quotients $\frac{W_k^n}{I}$. We will show that these algebras are LF and regular, hence the bornology on them is defined in a unique way: *i.e.* any surjective bounded morphism between dagger algebras is strict. Moreover, we show that all morphisms between

dagger algebras are bounded (as in affinoid algebras theory) and also that all morphisms are strongly bounded, with respect to the "sub-generalized ring" $\Sigma_{A^\diamond} \hookrightarrow \Sigma_A$ (this property hints the possibility of the existence of a theory of models of analytic varieties also in archimedean analytic geometry which we have no time to develop in this thesis; see remark 3.2.10 for some more details on this idea). We describe basic constructions like tensor products and direct products of dagger algebras and this machinery permit us to define, in this context, the "generalized ring of fractions" as done in rigid geometry with the difference that now the universal properties must be stated with respect to weakly power-bounded elements. Next, we define the category of dagger affinoid spaces as the dual of the category of dagger affinoid algebras and study its representation by mean of the bornological spectrum that we defined in the previous chapter. We see that in the non-archimedean case the category of strict dagger affinoid spaces is equivalent to the category of wide strict k-affinoid space defined by Berkovich (proposition 3.4.2), which is an already known result, and that this equivalence gives an homeomorphism of the underlying topological spaces and we generalize this result to the case when the dagger affinoid algebras and the germs of analytic spaces are not strict, proposition 3.4.3. Then we see that in the archimedean case the bornological spectrum of the dagger affinoid algebras coincides with the set of maximal ideal of the algebra and we define the notion of dagger affinoid subdomain requiring the usual universal property, checking some of the basic properties they share with the classical rigid constructions, whose proves rely on the same ideas. We underline, again, that the machinery developed until here permit us to handle both the archimedean and the non-archimedean case for base field.

The next chapter is devoted to prove the Tate acyclicity theorem for coverings made of strict dagger rational subdomains. The proof of the theorem is classical and use the same idea of reduction to the case of Laurent covering used by Tate himself. It's quite obvious that the proof of Tate can be used to prove the acyclicity of the structural sheaf for dagger affinoid spaces when k is non-archimedean. It is not so obvious that the same argument works with k archimedean, and so this chapter is devoted to check that this is true. Anyway, mainly the arguments used in this chapter are the same that can be found in the chapter 8 of [26].

The fifth chapter contains the main structural result in the theory of dagger affinoid spaces: the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem. We start this chapter by studying in detail the notion of dagger affinoid subdomain in the case where k is archimedean. We show that in this case a subdomain $U \subset X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ is a compact Stein subset that, in general, may have empty interior. In theorem 5.1.4 we show that the dagger algebra A_U we associate to U by requiring the universal property characterizing subdomains, is in fact, for any rational subdomain of X, isomorphic to the algebra of germs of analytic functions $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_X(U)$ that the canonical immersions $U \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ induces on U. This enable us to give another proof of Tate acyclicity for rational coverings, when k is archimedean (theorem 5.1.17), by exploting the fact that the rational dagger site of X is contained in what we call the compact Stein site of X: the site given by the G-topology in which the coverings of X are given by finite coverings by compact Stein subsets. We will then see another peculiar feature of archimedean subdomains: the failure of the transitivity property of Weierstrass subdomains, *i.e.* if $U \subset V \subset X$ are two Weierstrass subdomain embeddings then in rigid geometry we can conclude that also the composition $U \subset X$ is a Weierstrass subdomain embedding. But the proof of this result relies on the non-archimedean character of the base field and we will see that in the archimedean case one can only state that the inclusion $U \subset X$ is rational. We end the chapter with our main result in the theory of dagger affinoid spaces: our generalization of the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem. We remark that in the non-archimedean case this result follows easily from the classical one, instead in the archimedean case one has to work out a new proof. Our proof is inspired by the new proof of Temkin of the affinoid version of the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem [31] and will exploit the peculiar properties of archimedean subdomains.

In the last chapter we construct the category of k-dagger analytic spaces, for k any valued field. With the aid of the dagger affinoid theory developed so far, we can use the same methods of Berkovich, used in [30], to define our analytic spaces. The first section is devoted to some auxiliary results on the category of finite modules on a dagger affinoid algebra and of the category of coherent sheaves over a dagger affinoid space. In particular we endow any finite module with a canonical filtration induced by the filtration of the dagger algebra over which it is defined and we shows analog results of [28]: the category of finite modules over a dagger algebra is equivalent to the category of finite dagger modules (proposition 6.1.6), *i.e.* every finite module admits a unique canonical structure of complete bornological module over A and every A-linear morphism between finite dagger modules is bounded; and then we deduce the general version of the Tate's acyclicity theorem for any finite module over any (also non-strict) k-dagger algebra. Then we end this section with a proof of the Kiehl theorem which is an adaptation of the classical proof in rigid geometry. In the next section we introduce the notion of a k-dagger analytic space over any complete valued field. We use the methods of Berkovich nets developed in [30] and basically we follow the discussion of the first chapter of this work to define our spaces. So for us, a k-dagger analytic space is a triple (X, A, τ) where X is a locally Hausdorff topological space, τ a Berkovich net on X and A an atlas of dagger affinoid algebras for the net τ. We see that we can perform all the constructions of [30], underlining the differences of the two approach and the relations of dagger analytic spaces with the pro-analytic structure on the pro-site (as defined in appendix A) of X. The last section of the sixth chapter is devoted to the study the relations between our dagger analytic spaces and the other definitions of analytic spaces already present in literature. First we deal with the non-archimedean case, in which we are mainly interested to compare our dagger spaces with Grosse-Klönne ones. Then we show that in the complex case, the category of classical complex analytic spaces embeds in a fully faithful way in the category of dagger spaces. wE end this work by showing how the GAGA principle looks like in this new context.

Chapter 1

Bornological structures

1.1 Bornological sets

Definition 1.1.1. *Let X be a set. A* bornology *on X is a collection $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathscr{P}(X)$ such that*

1. *$\mathcal{B}$ is a covering of X,* i.e. *$\forall x \in X, \exists B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $x \in B$;*
2. *$\mathcal{B}$ is stable under inclusions,* i.e. *$A \subset B \in \mathcal{B} \Rightarrow A \in \mathcal{B}$;*
3. *$\mathcal{B}$ is stable under finite unions,* i.e. *for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_1, ..., B_n \in \mathcal{B}$, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} B_i \in \mathcal{B}$.*

The pair $(X, \mathcal{B})$ is called a bornological set*, and the elements of $\mathcal{B}$ are called* bounded subsets *of X (with respect to $\mathcal{B}$, if it is needed to specify).*

We recall that $\mathscr{P}(X)$ has the structure of a boolean algebra with respect to the operations $\cup, \cap$ and the complementation $Y \mapsto \overline{Y} = X - Y$, for $Y \in \mathscr{P}(X)$. Thus the definition of a bornology on X is equivalent to the request that the collection $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathscr{P}(X)$ is an ideal of $\mathscr{P}(X)$ that contains the ideal $\mathscr{F}(X)$ defined by the finite subsets of X. So, the family of bornologies over a set X is in one-to-one correspondence with the ideals of the algebra $\mathscr{P}(X)/\mathscr{F}(X)$ and form a complete lattice with respect to unions (more precisely, the ideal generated by the unions) and intersections.

For any collection $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathscr{P}(X)$ there is a minimal bornology $\mathcal{B}$ on X such that $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{B}$, that is the smallest ideal of $\mathscr{P}(X)$ that contains the ideal generated by $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathscr{F}(X)$. This bornology is called the bornology *generated* by $\mathcal{S}$ and is denoted $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$, while $\mathcal{S}$ is said to be a *bornological pre-basis* of $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$. A family $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathscr{P}(X)$ is called a *bornological basis* of $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ if it is a covering of X and for any $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ there exists $B \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $B_1 \cup B_2 \subset B$.

Example 1.1.2.

1. Each set X has two distinguished bornologies, which coincide trivially if X is finite. They are the maximum and the minimum element of the lattice of the family of bornologies over X. The former is called the *chaotic bornology*, for which $\mathcal{B} = \mathscr{P}(X)$, and the latter *trivial bornology*, for which $\mathcal{B} = \mathscr{F}(X)$.

2. The fact that $\mathcal{B}$ is an ideal of the boolean algebra $\mathscr{P}(X)$ imply that to check that a bornology is chaotic is enough to know that for one subset $Y \subset X$ both $Y, X - Y \in \mathcal{B}$. In fact, the only ideal for which it can happen is the improper ideal.

3. The bounded sets in a metric space form a bornology.

A *morphism* of bornological sets $\varphi : (X, \mathcal{B}_X) \to (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$ is defined to be a bounded map $\varphi : X \to Y$, *i.e.* a map of sets such that $\varphi(B) \in \mathcal{B}_Y$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_X$. To check that a map is bounded is sufficient to check that $\varphi(B) \in \mathcal{B}_Y$ for B in a basis of $\mathcal{B}_X$. It is clear that

the set theoretic composition of two bounded maps is a bounded map, so we can define the category of bornological sets, denoted **Born**, with objects bornological sets and arrows bounded maps.

Remark 1.1.3. Notice that if $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ are two bornologies on a set X then $\mathrm{Id}_X : (X, \mathcal{B}_1) \to (X, \mathcal{B}_2)$ is a bounded map if and only if $\mathcal{B}_1 \subset \mathcal{B}_2$, the opposite of the conditions that one finds for topologies over X. Indeed, the strongest bornology on X is the trivial bornology and the weakest is the chaotic one.

Let $(X, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological set and $f : Y \to X$ a map of sets. The family $f^{-1}(\mathcal{B}) := \{f^{-1}(B)\}_{B\in\mathcal{B}}$ is a basis for a bornology on Y denoted $f^*\mathcal{B}$; it is the maximal bornology on Y such that f is a bounded map. If f is an injective map, we write $\mathcal{B}|_Y = f^*\mathcal{B}$ and call it the *induced bornology* on Y.

For a set theoretic inclusion $i : Y \to (X, \mathcal{B})$ the induced bornology on Y has the usual universal property: in the diagram



f is bounded if and only if $i \circ f$ is bounded. In fact if f is bounded the $i \circ f$ is bounded, and by definition of induced bornology if f is not bounded this implies that $i \circ f$ is not bounded, since f must map a bounded set of Z on a set which is not in the bornology of Y. It is also clear that the induced bornology is uniquely determined by this property.

Definition 1.1.4. *We say that a monomorphism $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y) \to (X, \mathcal{B}_X)$ is* regular *if Y has the bornology induced by X. A subobject of $(X, \mathcal{B}_X)$ is an equivalence class of regular monomorphisms.*

Similarly, if $g : X \to Z$ is another map of sets, and $\mathcal{B}$ a bornology on X, the family $g(\mathcal{B}) := \{B\}_{B\in\mathcal{B}}$ is a pre-basis for a bornology $g_*\mathcal{B} \doteq \langle g(\mathcal{B})\rangle$ on Z, minimal among the bornologies for which g is bounded. If g is surjective, we call $g_*(\mathcal{B})$ the *quotient bornology* of $\mathcal{B}$ under g, and moreover in this case $g_*(\mathcal{B}) = g(\mathcal{B})$.

For a surjection $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}) \to Z$ the quotient bornology on Z has the following universal property: in the diagram



f is bounded if and only if $f \circ \pi$ is bounded. Indeed, if f is bounded then $f \circ \pi$ is bounded. Otherwise if f is not bounded then there exists a bounded set for the quotient bornology $B \subset Z$ such that $f(B)$ is not bounded. But by definition there exist a bounded set $B' \subset X$ such that $\pi(B') = B$, so $f \circ \pi$ is not bounded.

Definition 1.1.5. *We say that an epimorphism $f : (X, \mathcal{B}_X) \to (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$ is* regular *if Y has the quotient bornology given by f. A quotient object of $(X, \mathcal{B}_X)$ is an equivalence class of regular epimorphisms.*

The category of bornological sets admits small limits, with the following description. Let $(X_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i\in I}$ be a small family of bornological sets, then the direct product $\prod_{i\in I}(X_i, \mathcal{B}_i)$ is defined to be the set $\prod_{i\in I} X_i$ equipped with the bornology generated by the family

$$\left\{ \prod_{i\in I} B_i | B_i \in \mathcal{B}_i, \forall i \in I \right\}.$$

This bornology is the biggest bornology on $\prod_{i\in I} X_i$ such that all the projections

$$\pi_j : \prod_{i\in I} X_i \to X_j$$

are bounded.

Moreover, given two bounded maps of bornological sets $\varphi : (X, \mathcal{B}_X) \to (Z, \mathcal{B}_Z), \psi : (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y) \to (Z, \mathcal{B}_Z)$ the fiber product $(X, \mathcal{B}_X) \times_{(Z,\mathcal{B}_Z)} (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$ is defined as the fiber product of sets $X \times_Z Y = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y | \varphi(x) = \psi(y)\}$, equipped with the bornology generated by the family

$$\{B \times_Z C | B \in \mathcal{B}_X, C \in \mathcal{B}_Y\}.$$

Hence $(X, \mathcal{B}_X) \times_{(Z,\mathcal{B}_Z)} (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$ is equipped with the bornology induced by the inclusion in $(X, \mathcal{B}_X) \times (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$. Notice that, as in the case of topological spaces, the bornology on $(X, \mathcal{B}_X) \times_{(Z,\mathcal{B}_Z)} (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$ doesn't depend on the bornology on Z.

For coproducts, let $(X_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i\in I}$ be a small family of bornological sets, then the coproduct $\coprod_{i\in I}(X_i, \mathcal{B}_i)$ is defined to be the set $\coprod_{i\in I} X_i$ equipped with the bornology generated by the family

$$\left\{ \coprod_{i\in I} B_i | B_i \in \mathcal{B}_i, \text{ and } B_i = \varnothing, \forall \text{ but a finite number of } i \right\}.$$

This bornology is the smallest bornology on $\coprod_{i\in I} X_i$ such that all the injections

$$\alpha_j : X_j \to \coprod_{i\in I} X_i$$

are bounded.

We can describe pushouts taking two maps $\varphi : (X, \mathcal{B}_X) \to (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y), \psi : (X, \mathcal{B}_X) \to (Z, \mathcal{B}_Z)$ and giving to the set theoretic pushout $Y \coprod_X Z$ the bornology generated by the family

$$\left\{ C \coprod_X D | D \in \mathcal{C}, D \in \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$

Hence $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y) \coprod_{(X,\mathcal{B}_X)} (Z, \mathcal{B}_Z)$ is equipped with the bornology induced by the surjection from $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y) \coprod (Z, \mathcal{B}_Z)$. Notice that, as in the case of topological spaces, the bornology on $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y) \coprod_{(X,\mathcal{B}_X)} (Z, \mathcal{B}_Z)$ doesn't depend on the bornology on X.

So, we can summarize what we said with the next proposition.

Proposition 1.1.6. *The category of bornological sets is complete and cocomplete and the forgetful functor U : **Born** $\to$ **Sets**, to the category of sets, commutes with limits and colimits.*

Proof. □

Recall that the completeness of **Born** ensure that the categorical notions of regular, strict and effective monomorphism (and respectively for epimorphism) coincides.

Proposition 1.1.7. Born *is a concrete topological category.*

Proof. A concrete category $U : \mathbf{Born} \to \mathbf{Sets}$ is said topological if U is a topological functor. This mean that for any diagram of the form

$$(B \xrightarrow{f_i} UA_i)_{i\in I}$$

there exists a unique initial lift

$$A \xrightarrow{\overline{f}_i} A_i.$$

In the category of topological spaces this universal problem is solved by taking the weak topology defined by the maps f_i, and in the category of bornological sets we can give the same description of the "weak bornology" which solve the same problem. Just take the intersection

$$\bigcap_{i\in I} f_i^*(\mathcal{B}_i) \subset \mathscr{P}(B)$$

of all the bornologies induced by the A_i's. This is a bornology on B and is the biggest bornology (hence the weakest, cf. remark 1.1.3) for which all the maps f_i are bounded. To give a lift of B is the same to give a bornolgy on B. If A' is such a lift such that

$$A' \xrightarrow{\overline{f}'_i} A_i$$

is well defined, *i.e.* all maps are bounded, then the bornology of A' is smaller than the bornolgy of A and so the identity map

$$A' \to A$$

is bounded, showing that A is the unique initial lift. □

1.2 Bornological groups

Definition 1.2.1. *A group $(G, \cdot)$ is said to be a* bornological group *if the set G is equipped with a bornology such that the maps $(g, h) \mapsto g \cdot h$ (giving to $G \times G$ the product bornology) and $g \mapsto g^{-1}$ are bounded. If $(G, \mathcal{B})$ is a bornological group, we also say that $\mathcal{B}$ is a* group bornology*. A morphism of bornological groups is a group homomorphism which is also a bounded map.*

Example 1.2.2.

1. On $\mathbb{Q}$ each valuation, archimedean $|\cdot|_\infty$ or non-archimedean $|\cdot|_p$, give rise to a bornology on the additive group $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$. A basis for the bornology is the set of closed disks
$$D_{|\cdot|_*}(0, q^+) = \{x \in \mathbb{Q} || x|_* \leqslant q\}$$
with $* \in \{\infty, 2, 3, 5, ...\}$.

2. The additive group $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$ can be equipped by the bornology generated by the half-lines $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} | n \leqslant a\}$, for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. This bornology is not a group bornology because the map $x \mapsto -x$ is not bounded.

3. Consider the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{C}^\times, \cdot)$, endowed with the bornology induced by the usual bornology on $\mathbb{C}$. This is not a group bornology on $\mathbb{C}$, because inversion is not bounded. The standard way to make $\mathbb{C}^\times$ into a bornological group is to equip it with the bornology induced by the embedding $(id_{\mathbb{C}}, inv_{\mathbb{C}}) : \mathbb{C}^\times \to \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$, where the target space is equipped with the product bornology.

Let $(G, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological group and let $f : H \to G$ be an homomorphism of groups, then $(H, f^*\mathcal{B})$ is a bornological group. In fact, if $B_1, B_2 \in f^*\mathcal{B}$, then $B_1 \subset f^{-1}(B_1^G)$ and $B_2 \subset f^{-1}(B_2^G)$ for $B_1^G, B_2^G \in \mathcal{B}$. So if $h \in f^{-1}(B_1^G) + f^{-1}(B_2^G)$, then $h = h_1 + h_2$, with $h_1 \in f^{-1}(B_1^G), h_2 \in f^{-1}(B_2^G)$ and

$$f(h) = f(h_1 + h_2) = f(h_1) + f(h_2) \in B_1^G + B_2^G,$$

hence $h \in f^{-1}(B_1^G + B_2^G)$. And given $h \in f^{-1}(B_1^G + B_2^G)$ then $h \in f^{-1}(g_1 + g_2)$ with $g_1 \in B_1^G, g_2 \in B_2^G$. Since given two representatives $\tilde{g}_1 \in f^{-1}(g_1), \tilde{g}_2 \in f^{-1}(g_2)$ we can write

$$f^{-1}(g_1 + g_2) = (\tilde{g}_1 + \tilde{g}_2) + \mathrm{Ker}\,(f) = \tilde{g}_1 + \mathrm{Ker}\,(f) + \tilde{g}_2 + \mathrm{Ker}\,(f) = f^{-1}(g_1) + f^{-1}(g_2)$$

it follows that $h \in f^{-1}(B_1^G) + f^{-1}(B_2^G)$. So we showed that

$$B_1 + B_2 \subset f^{-1}(B_1^G) + f^{-1}(B_2^G) = f^{-1}(B_1^G + B_2^G)$$

is a bounded set.

On the other hand, given a morphism $f : G \to H$ then $f_*\mathcal{B}$ is a group bornology on H if f is surjective. In this case given $B_1, B_2 \in f_*\mathcal{B}$ then there exist $B_1^G, B_2^G \in G$ such that $f(B_1^G) = B_1$ and $f(B_2^G) = B_2$ so

$$f(B_1^G + B_2^G) = f(B_1^G) + f(B_2^G) = B_1 + B_2$$

which is bounded. But this argument works only if f is surjective, and is easy to construct examples where $f_*\mathcal{B}$ fails to be a group bornology (for example take the immersion $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ with the canonical metric bornology on $\mathbb{R}$).

In any case there exists a smallest group bornology which contains $f_*\mathcal{B}$, thanks to the next lemma.

Lemma 1.2.3. *Let G be a group and $(\mathcal{B}_i)_{i\in I}$ be any family of group bornologies over G, then $\bigcap_{i\in I} \mathcal{B}_i$ is a group bornology on G.*

Proof. We know that $\mathcal{B} = \bigcap_{i\in I} \mathcal{B}_i$ is a bornology, we must show that it is a group bornology. Let $B, C \in \mathcal{B}$, then $B, C \in \mathcal{B}_i$ for any $i \in I$ and so

$$B + C \in \mathcal{B}_i$$

because $\mathcal{B}_i$ are group bornology. So $B + C \in \mathcal{B}$.

To check that the map $x \mapsto -x$ is bounded we can proceed in similar fashion. □

Lemma 1.2.4. *Let G be a group and $\mathcal{B}$ a bornology on G. Then $\mathcal{B}$ is a group bornology if and only if there exists a basis $\{B_i\}_{i\in I}$ for $\mathcal{B}$ such that*

$$B_i + B_j \subset B_{i_1} \cup ... \cup B_{i_n}$$

for any $i, j \in I$ and

$$-B_i \subset B_{j_1} \cup ... \cup B_{j_n}$$

for any $i \in I$.

Proof. If $\mathcal{B}$ is a group bornology then $B_i + B_j$ is bounded and hence must be contained in a finite union of the elements of the basis and the same is true for $-B_i$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{B}$ has such a basis then for any couple of bounded subsets $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ we have that $R_1 \subset B_{i_1}$ and $R_2 \subset B_{i_2}$ for some $i_1, i_2 \in I$. Then

$$-R_1 \subset -B_{i_1}$$

and

$$R_1 + R_2 \subset B_{i_1} + B_{i_2}$$

which shows that multiplication and inversion are bounded maps. □

We denote **Born**(**Ab**) the category of bornological abelian groups. It is easy to describe products and coproducts for any small family $(G_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Ab}))$; indeed the group $\prod_{i\in I} G_i$

$$\prod_{i\in I} \mathcal{B}_i = \left\{ B | B \subset \prod_{i\in I} B_i, B_i \in \mathcal{B}_i \right\}$$

is the product of $(G_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i\in I}$, in **Born**(**Ab**). While endowing $\bigoplus_{i\in I} G_i$ with the bornology

$$\bigoplus_{i\in I} \mathcal{B}_i = \left\{ B | B \subset \bigoplus_{i\in I} B_i, B_i \in \mathcal{B}_i, B_i = 0 \text{ for almost all } i \in I \right\}$$

we get the coproducts in **Born**(**Ab**).

In this settings we have that the canonical projections

$$\pi_j : \prod_{i\in I} G_i \to G_j$$

and the canonical injections

$$i_j : G_j \to \bigoplus_{i\in I} G_i$$

are morphisms of bornological groups.

We leave to the reader the details of the descriptions of the pullbacks and pushouts in **Born**(**Ab**), since it's enough, as above, to put on the limit, or colimit, calculated in the category **Ab**, of abelian groups, the canonical bornolgies that one need to ensure the universal properties involved. Hence we notice that the forgetful functor **Born**(**Ab**) $\to$ **Ab**, from the category of bornological abelian groups to the category of abelian groups, commutes with limits and colimits.

In the next we follow very closely the discussion of Prosmans-Sneiders [21] on bornological vector spaces, adapting it to the case of bornological abelian groups.

Proposition 1.2.5. *The category* **Born**(**Ab**) *is additive and moreover, if $f : G \to H$ is a morphism of bornological groups, then*

1. $\mathrm{Ker}\, f$ *is the subset $f^{-1}(0)$ of G endowed with the induced bornology;*
2. $\mathrm{Coker}\, f$ *is the quotient $H/f(G)$ endowed with the quotient bornology;*
3. $\mathrm{Im}\, f$ *is the subset $f(G)$ of H endowed with the induced bornology;*
4. $\mathrm{Coim}\, f$ *is the quotient $G/f^{-1}(0)$ endowed with the quotient bornology.*

Proof. **Born**(**Ab**) is additive because for any $g_1, g_2 \in \mathrm{Hom}\,(G, H)$, $h_1 \in \mathrm{Hom}\,(H_2, G)$, $h_2 \in \mathrm{Hom}\,(H, H_1)$ and B bounded in G

$$(g_1 + g_2)(B) = \{g_1(x) + g_2(x) | x \in B\} \subset g_1(B) + g_2(B)$$

is bounded and the equalities $(g_1 + g_2) \circ h_1 = g_1 \circ h_1 + g_2 \circ h_1$, $h_2 \circ (g_1 + g_2) = h_2 \circ g_1 + h_2 \circ g_2$ hold because they hold for abelian group and all maps are bounded.

The other statements have similar proves, so we do only the first one as an example. Let $f : G \to H$ be a bounded homomorphism of bornological groups and $\mathrm{Ker}\, f$ be the kernel of f in the algebraic sense. Then for any homomorphism $\phi : G' \to G$ such that $f \circ \phi = 0$ there exists a unique map $\psi : G' \to \mathrm{Ker}\,(f)$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} G' & \xrightarrow{\phi} & G & \xrightarrow{f} & H \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi} & \nearrow{\scriptstyle k} & & & \\ \mathrm{Ker}\,(f) & & & & \end{array}$$

commutes, where k is the canonical morphism. Now, if we ask that all maps are bounded we see that the request that $k \circ \psi$ is bounded for any bounded homomorphism ϕ is satisfied when $\operatorname{Ker} f$ has the bornology induced by the inclusion $\operatorname{Ker} f \hookrightarrow G$, as we saw in the previous section when we discussed the inclusions of bornological sets. □

We recall that, in general, a morphism $f : G \to H$ in an additive category with kernels and cokernels is called *strict* if the induced morphism $\overline{f} : \operatorname{Coim} u \to \operatorname{Im} u$ is an isomorphism.

Proposition 1.2.6. *A morphism of bornological abelian groups $f : G \to H$ is strict if and only if for any bounded subset B of H there is a bounded subset B' of G such that*

$$B \cap f(G) = f(B').$$

Proof. Thanks to the preceding proposition f is strict if and only if the morphism

$$\overline{f} : G/f^{-1}(0) \to f(G)$$

is an isomorphism in $\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Ab})$. The map is an algebraic isomorphism, so it is a bornological isomorphism if and only if it identify the quotient bornology on $G/f^{-1}(0)$ with the bornology induced on $f(G)$ by H. This happen precisely when the conditions of the proposition are verified because, by definition, each bounded subset in $G/f^{-1}(0)$ is the image of a bounded subset $B' \subset G$ and any bounded subset in $f(G)$ is of the form $B \cap f(G)$ for a bounded subset $B \subset H$. □

Corollary 1.2.7. *Let $f : G \to H$ be morphism of bornological abelian groups. f is a strict monomorphism (resp. a strict epimorphism) if and only if it is a regular monomorphism (resp. regular epimorphism) of bornological sets.*

Definition 1.2.8. *An additive category is called* quasi-abelian *if it admits kernels and cokernels, and if the class of strict epimorphisms (resp. strict monomorphisms) is stable under pullbacks (resp. pushouts). This means that given a cartesian square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{v} & B \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ A & \xrightarrow{u} & C \end{array}$$

where u is a strict epimorphism then v is a strict epimorphism. Dually for monomorphisms and cocartesian squares.

We record the following fact for the sake of clearness.

Proposition 1.2.9. *Let G, H be two bornological groups and $G \oplus H$ be their direct sum, then the canonical maps*

$$\pi_G : G \oplus H \to G, \pi_H : G \oplus H \to H$$

and

$$i_G : G \to G \oplus H, i_H : H \to G \oplus H$$

are strict morphisms.

Proof. To be a strict morphism is equivalent to be a regular morphism as map of bornological sets, thanks to 1.2.7. The bornology on $G \oplus H$ for which the maps π_G, π_H, i_G, i_H become strict is the canonical bornology given by the universal property of the direct sum. □

Proposition 1.2.10. *The category* $\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Ab})$ *is quasi-abelian.*

Proof. We have only to show that pullbacks and pushouts preserve, respectively, strict epimorphisms and strict monomorphisms.

Consider first the cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{v} & B \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ A & \xrightarrow{u} & C \end{array}$$

where u is a strict epimorphism. By the universal properties of the direct product and of the pullback if we define the map

$$\alpha = (u, -g) : A \oplus B \to C$$

then we have that

$$P \cong \operatorname{Ker} \alpha = \{(a, b) \in A \oplus B | g(a) = u(b)\}.$$

We also have the canonical epimorphisms π_A, π_B, the canonical monomorphism $i_\alpha : \operatorname{Ker} \alpha \to A \oplus B$ and we can write

$$f = \pi_A \circ i_\alpha, v = \pi_B \circ i_\alpha.$$

The map v is well known to be surjective, we have to show that is strict. Let $B_1 \subset B$ be a bounded subset, so $g(B_1)$ is bounded and since u is strict we can find a bounded subset $B_2 \subset A$ such that $u(B_2) = g(B_1)$. Hence, $\pi_A^{-1}(B_2) \cap \pi_B^{-1}(B_1) = B_2 \times B_1$ is a bounded subset of $A \oplus B$ and

$$P \cap \pi_A^{-1}(B_2) \cap \pi_B^{-1}(B_1) = \alpha^{-1}(0) \cap \pi_A^{-1}(B_2) \cap \pi_B^{-1}(B_1) = i_\alpha^{-1}(\pi_A^{-1}(B_2) \cap \pi_B^{-1}(B_1)) \subset \operatorname{Ker} \alpha$$

is a bounded subset of P, and finally

$$v(i_\alpha^{-1}(\pi_A^{-1}(B_2) \cap \pi_B^{-1}(B_1))) = \pi_B \circ i_\alpha(i_\alpha^{-1}(\pi_A^{-1}(B_2) \cap \pi_B^{-1}(B_1))) = B_1,$$

because v is surjective.

Now consider the cocartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \xrightarrow{u} & B \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow f \\ A & \xrightarrow{v} & S \end{array} \tag{1.2.10.1}$$

where u is a strict monomorphism. If we set

$$\alpha = (g, -u) : C \to A \oplus B$$

then we have

$$S \cong \operatorname{Coker} \alpha = \frac{A \oplus B}{\alpha(C)}$$

with the canonical morphisms $i_A : A \to A \oplus B$, $i_B : B \to A \oplus B$, $q_\alpha : A \oplus B \to S$ and

$$v = q_\alpha \circ i_A \text{ and } f = q_\alpha \circ i_B.$$

v is well known to be injective, we have to show that it is strict. Let $R \subset S$ be a bounded subset and $R_1 \subset A \oplus B$ another such that $q_\alpha(R_1) = R$. We must show that $v^{-1}(q_\alpha(R_1))$ is bounded in A. By definition we can find $R_A \subset A$ and $R_B \subset B$ such that $R_1 \subset R_A \times R_B$, hence

$$v^{-1}(q_\alpha(R_1)) \subset v^{-1}(q_\alpha(R_A \times R_B)) = v^{-1}(q_\alpha(R_A \times \{0\}) + q_\alpha(\{0\} \times R_B)) =$$

$$= v^{-1}(q_\alpha \circ i_A(R_A)) + v^{-1}(q_\alpha \circ i_B(R_B))$$

since $R_A \times R_B = (R_A \times \{0\}) + (\{0\} \times R_B)$ and $v^{-1}(R + R') = v^{-1}(R) + v^{-1}(R')$, and

$$v^{-1}(q_\alpha \circ i_A(R_A)) + v^{-1}(q_\alpha \circ i_B(R_B)) = v^{-1}(v(R_A)) + v^{-1}(f(R_B)).$$

Since u is a monomorphism it has a left inverse u^{-1} and

$$u^{-1}(R_B) = R_B \cap C$$

which is bounded in C because u is a strict monomorphism and so C can be canonically identified with $\mathrm{Im}\,(C) \subset B$. It's enough to show that $v^{-1}(f(R_B)) \subset g(u^{-1}(R_B))$, because g is a bounded map. So, since v is injective

$$x \in v^{-1}(f(R_B)) \iff x \in f(R_B) \cap A \iff x \in f(R_B) \cap \mathrm{Im}\,(v \circ g) \iff x \in \mathrm{Im}\,(f \circ u)$$

and this implies that $\exists y \in R_B \cap C$ such that $f(u(y)) = x$ *i.e.* $v(g(y)) \in f(R_B)$ which implies that $x = g(y) \in v^{-1}(f(R_B))$.

So we have that

$$v^{-1}(q_\alpha(R_1)) \subset R_A + v^{-1}(f(R_B))$$

is bounded because $(x, y) \mapsto x + y$ is a bounded map. And this proves the proposition. □

Remark 1.2.11. This proof is in total analogy with the proof 1.8 in [21], which works for bornological vector spaces of convex type over a non-trivially valued field. We remark that our generalization of the proof uses, to show that cocartesian squares preserve strict monomorphisms, the boundedness of the addition instead of using the absolute convex envelopes as done in [21].

Proposition 1.2.12. *In the category* **Born**(**Ab**) *direct sums and direct products are kernel and cokernel preserving.*

Proof. Let's show that direct sums are cokernel preserving. If $(f_i : E_i \to F_i)_{i\in I}$ is a family of morphisms of **Born**(**Ab**) we know that algebraically $\mathrm{Coker}\,(\oplus_i f_i) \cong \bigoplus_i \mathrm{Coker}\, f_i$. Let us denote by $\alpha : \bigoplus_{i\in I} F_i \to \mathrm{Coker}\,(\oplus_i f_i)$ and $\alpha_i : F_i \to \mathrm{Coker}\,(f_i)$ the canonical maps, so that we have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \bigoplus_{i\in I} E_i & \xrightarrow{\oplus f_i} & \bigoplus_{i\in I} F_i & \xrightarrow{\oplus \alpha_i} & \bigoplus_{i\in I} \mathrm{Coker}\,(f_i) \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} & \nearrow_{\gamma} & \\ & & \mathrm{Coker}\,(\oplus_i f_i) & & \end{array}$$

.

We know that $\mathrm{Coker}\,(\oplus_i f_i)$ carries the quotient bornology given by the map α that can be described by the image of bounded subsets of $\bigoplus_{i\in I} F_i$. These are of the form $\alpha(B_{i_1} \times ... \times B_{i_n})$ for bounded subsets $B_{i_j} \subset F_{i_j}$ then the bornology on $\mathrm{Coker}\,(\oplus_i f_i)$ and on $\bigoplus_i \mathrm{Coker}\, f_i$ coincide.

Let us show that they are kernel preserving. Consider a family $(u_i : E_i \to F_i)_{i\in I}$ of morphisms of **Born**(**Ab**) and for any u_i denote K_i the kernel of u_i and $k_i : K_i \to E_i$ the canonical morphisms. We have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{i\in I} K_i & \xrightarrow{\oplus_{i\in I} k_i} & \bigoplus_{i\in I} E_i & \xrightarrow{\oplus_{i\in I} u_i} & \bigoplus_{i\in I} F_i \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \gamma} & \nearrow_{\alpha} & & & \\ & & \mathrm{Ker}\,(\oplus_i u_i) & & & & \end{array}$$

.

where γ is an isomorphism of abelian groups. Let us show that is it also an isomorphism of bornological abelian groups.

Let B be a bounded subset of $\bigoplus_{i\in I} E_i$. By corollary 1.2.7, it is sufficient to show that

$$(\bigoplus_{i\in I} k_i)^{-1}(B)$$

is a bounded subset of $\bigoplus_{i\in I} K_i$. We know that $B \subset \bigoplus_{i\in I} B_i$ for some bounded subset $B_i \subset E_i$ where $B_i = \{0\}$ for almost all i. Moreover, $k_i^{-1}(B_i)$ is a bounded subset of K_i for any $i \in I$ and $k_i^{-1}(\{0\}) = \{0\} \subset K_i$ cause k_i is injective. It follows that

$$(\bigoplus_{i\in I} k_i)^{-1}(B) = \bigoplus_{i\in I}(k_i^{-1})(B_i)$$

is a bounded subset of $\bigoplus_{i\in I} K_i$.

Analogous (dual) arguments work for direct products. □

Remark 1.2.13. The quasi-abelian property of the category of bornological abelian groups is important when one wants to study sheaves of bornological groups (especially bornological vector spaces or bornological modules) over a topological space, so that this allows to use the theory of quasi-abelian categories and quasi-abelian sheaves developed by Snejder [42].

1.3 Bornological rings

In this work the word *ring* will always mean a commutative ring with 1. Given a ring $(A, +, \cdot)$ and a bornology $\mathcal{B}$ on A, $(A, +, \cdot, \mathcal{B})$ is said to be a *bornological ring* if

1. $(A, +, \mathcal{B})$ is a bornological group;
2. the map $(x, y) \mapsto x \cdot y$ is bounded with respect the product bornology on $A \times A$.

Bornological rings (resp. domains, resp. fields) form a category, with bounded homomorphisms as morphisms, which we denote **Born**(**Rings**) (resp. **Born**(**Dom**), resp. **Born**(**Fields**)). Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring and let $f : C \to A$ (resp. $f : A \to C$) be a homomorphism of rings, then $(C, f^*\mathcal{B})$ (resp. $(C, f_*\mathcal{B})$ with f surjective) is a bornological ring and f is a morphism in **Born**(**Rings**). In particular, a monomorphism (resp. epimorphism) of bornological rings is an injective (resp. surjective) map.

We say that a morphism $f : A \to B$ in **Born**(**Rings**) is a *strict* morphism if it is strict as of morphism of the underlying abelian groups.

Lemma 1.3.1. *Let A be a ring and $(\mathcal{B}_i)_{i\in I}$ be any family of ring bornologies on A, then $\bigcap_{i\in I} \mathcal{B}_i$ is a ring bornology on A.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of lemma 1.2.3. □

Lemma 1.3.2. *Let A be a ring and $\mathcal{B}$ a bornology on A, then $\mathcal{B}$ is a ring bornology if and only if $\mathcal{B}$ has a basis $\{B_i\}_{i\in I}$ such that $\{B_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a basis for a group bornology (for the additive group of A) and for every $i, j \in I$*

$$B_i B_j \subset B_{i_1} \cup \ldots \cup B_{i_n}$$

for some $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in I$.

Proof. Similar to the analogous lemma for group bornologies □

Born(**Rings**) admits small limits and colimits which we now describe. Limits are easy to handle because the products in **Born**(**Rings**) is just the set theoretic product with the product bornology. So $\prod_{i\in I}(A_i,\mathcal{B}_i)=\prod_{i\in I}A_i$ with the bornology generated by the family

$$\prod_{i\in I}\mathcal{B}_i=\left\{\prod_{i\in I}B_i|B_i\in\mathcal{B}_i\right\}$$

is the direct product of a family of objects in **Born**(**Rings**). Moreover we can describe the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A\times_C B & \longrightarrow & B \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A & \longrightarrow & C \end{array}$$

giving to the set $A\times_C B$ the bornology generated by the family $\{B_1\times_C B_2\}$ such that B_1 is bounded in A and B_2 is bounded in B. We conclude that the forgetful functors **Born**(**Rings**) $\to$ **Born**(**Ab**) and **Born**(**Rings**) $\to$ **Born** commute with limits.

On the other hand in the category of commutative rings coproducts are tensor products and we can make then into bornological rings in the following way. Given two morphism $R\to A$ and $R\to B$ the pushout is $A\otimes_R B$ and in the case $R=\mathbb{Z}$ this is the coproduct (This definition extends naturally also for an arbitrary family of morphisms). Giving in all cases the smallest ring bornology which contains the images of the bornologies of the factors by the canonical maps (that exists by the previous lemma), we obtain the description of the coproducts and the pushouts in **Born**(**Rings**). More explicitly, we have the canonical injections $i_A:A\to A\otimes_R B$ which identifies A with $a\mapsto a\otimes 1$ and $i_B:B\to A\otimes_R B$ with $b\mapsto 1\otimes b$. Then take as the bornology of $A\otimes_R B$ the bornology given by the family of all subsets of $A\otimes_R B$ obtained by applying a finite number of algebraic operations to the image of the bounded subsets of A and B with respect to i_A and i_B.

So, **Born**(**Rings**) is also cocomplete but none of the forgetful functors **Born**(**Rings**) $\to$ **Born**(**Ab**) nor **Born**(**Rings**) $\to$ **Born** commutes with colimits, as usual on algebraic categories.

Definition 1.3.3. *A bornological ring $(A,\mathcal{B})$ is said* non-archimedean *if its subring $\mathbb{Z}\cdot 1_A$ is $\mathcal{B}$-bounded and* archimedean *otherwise.*

An archimedean bornological ring therefore contains as sub-object $\mathbb{Z}$ equipped with a bornology for which it is an unbounded subset, and so it is necessarly of characteristic 0.

Let $(A,\mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring. We define

$$A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}=\{x\in A|\{x^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\in\mathcal{B}\}$$

and we call it the subset of $\mathcal{B}$-*power bounded* elements of A. Notice that $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a submonoid of $(A,\cdot)$ containing ±1 and 0, since for $x,y\in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ we have

$$\{(xy)^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset\{x^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\cdot\{y^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\in\mathcal{B}.$$

Let $U_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$ denote the subgroup of $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ consisting of its invertible elements. It is clear that $U_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$ is the unique minimal face[1] of the monoid $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$, so the complement $A^{\circ\circ}_{\mathcal{B}}=A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}\backslash U_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$ is the unique maximal ideal of the monoid.

We note also that if $\varphi:(A_1,\mathcal{B}_1)\to(A_2,\mathcal{B}_2)$ is a morphism of bornological rings then $\varphi(A_1^\circ)\subset A_2^\circ$, because if $\{x^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset A_1$ is a bounded subset then $\varphi(\{x^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}})=\{\varphi(x)^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ must be bounded in A_2. Hence we get a functor $^\circ$: **Born**(**Rings**) $\to$ **Monoids** from the category of bornological rings to the category of abelian monoids.

[1] A *face* in a monoid $(M,\cdot)$, commutative with 1, is a submonid $F\subset M$ such that, $\forall x,y\in M, xy\in F\iff x\in F$ and $y\in F$. An *ideal* of M is a subset $I\subset M$ such that $M\cdot I\subset I$.

Proposition 1.3.4. *Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring then $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a* saturated *submonoid of $(A, \cdot)$, in the sense that if $x \in A$ and there exists $n > 0$ such that $x^n \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ then $x \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \in A$ and that there exists $n > 0$ such that $x^n \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then $P = \{(x^n)^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded subset of $(A, \mathcal{B})$. Hence, xP, x^2P, ..., $x^{n-1}P$ are all $\mathcal{B}$-bounded and the subset

$$P \cup xP \cup ... \cup x^{n-1}P = \{x^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{B}$$

i.e. $x \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$. □

1.3.1 Convexity on bornological rings

Let's introduce the notion of convexity over a bornological ring.

Notation 1.3.5. Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring. For all $n = 1, 2, 3, ...$ we define $\mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}) \subset A^n$ as the set of n-tuples $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in A^n$ such that for all $x_1, ..., x_n \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Let's define

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(A) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}^n_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$$

where, if $m \geqslant n$, we identify $\mathcal{R}^n_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$ with the subset $\mathcal{R}^m_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$ of m-tuples with the last $m - n$ zero coordinate.

Definition 1.3.6. *Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring and V an A-module. A subset $S \subset V$ is said* absolutely convex *if for all n and for all $x_1, ..., x_n \in S$ and all $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$ one has that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \in S.$$

For all $S \subset V$, the absolutely convex hull $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ *of S in V is defined by the intersection of all absolutely convex subset of V containing S.*

Proposition 1.3.7. *Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring and V an A-module. The intersection of any family of absolutely convex subsets of V is absolutely convex, hence the definition of absolutely convex hull is well posed.*

Proof. Let $\{S_i \subset V\}_{i\in I}$ be a family of absolutely convex subsets of V. Let $x_1, ..., x_n \in \bigcap S_i$ and $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$ then by hypothesis

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j x_j \in S_i$$

for all S_i's, hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j x_j \in \bigcap S_i$$

so $\bigcap S_i$ is absolutely convex. □

The following easy to show fact, is often useful.

Lemma 1.3.8. *Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring then*

1. $\mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}) \subset (A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})^n$;
2. *let* $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$, *then for any* $(a_1, ..., a_n) \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ *we have that* $(\lambda_1 a_1, .., .\lambda_n a_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$, i.e. $\mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$ *is an ideal in* $(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})^n$ *with respect to the direct product monoid structure.*

Proof. 1. Since $0, 1 \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ by taking $\alpha_1 = (1, 0, ..., 0), ..., \alpha_n = (0, ..., 0, 1)$ we see that necessarily $\mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}) \subset (A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})^n$.

2. If $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$, $(a_1, ..., a_n) \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ and given any other n-tuple $(b_1, ..., b_n) \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ then
$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i a_i b_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (a_i b_i)$$
and since $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a monoid then $a_i b_i \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ and so $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (a_i b_i) \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$, hence $(\lambda_1 a_1, .., .\lambda_n a_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$.

□

Remark 1.3.9. The association $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} \mapsto \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$ is not functorial in general, *cf.* appendix B.

Proposition 1.3.10. *Let* $(A, \mathcal{B})$ *be a bornological ring and* V *an* A*-module. For all* $S \subset V$ *one has*
$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(S) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i | n = 1, 2, ..., (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}), x_1, ..., x_n \in S \right\}.$$

Proof. Let T be an absolutely convex subset of V containing S, then
$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(S) \subset T$$
by the definition of absolutely convex subset and the fact that $S \subset T$. So we need only to check that R is itself absolutely convex. Let $x_1, ..., x_n \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ and $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$, so
$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mu_{i,j} s_{i,j}$$
with $(\mu_{i,1}, ..., \mu_{i,m_j}) \in \mathcal{R}^{m_j}(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$. So we have to show that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mu_{i,j} \in \mathcal{R}^m(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$ where $m = \sum_{j=1}^n m_j$. Let $(a_{i,j}) \in (A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})^m$, then
$$\tilde{a}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mu_{i,j} a_{i,j} \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$$
by the choice of the $\mu_{i,j}$. Since by the previous lemma $\mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$ is an ideal of $(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})^n$ we have that $(\lambda_1 \tilde{a}_1, ..., \lambda_n \tilde{a}_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})$, so the claim follows. □

Proposition 1.3.11. *The definition of absolutely convex subset of an* A*-module coincides with the usual definition for* $A = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ *or for* A *a non-archimedean field, equipped with the usual bornologies induced by the valuations.*

Proof. For $A = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ and V and A-vector space, a subset S of V is absolutely convex in the classical sense if for any $\lambda_1, .., \lambda_n \in A$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i| \leqslant 1$, and any $x_1, ..., x_n \in S$ it happens that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \in S$. So, we have to show that, if $A = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ then
$$(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}) \iff \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i| \leqslant 1.$$

Let us show $\subseteq$ first. If $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$, we take the elements $x_i = \frac{|\lambda_i|}{\lambda_i} \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} = D_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1^+) := \{x \in \mathbb{C} || x| \leqslant 1\}$, for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$. So, by definition

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \frac{|\lambda_i|}{\lambda_i} \right| = \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i| \leqslant 1.$$

For the converse, if $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$ are such that $\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i| \leqslant 1$, then for any $x_1, ..., x_n \in D_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1^+)$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \right| \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i||x_i| \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i| \leqslant 1.$$

If A is a non-archimedean field, we denote R its ring of integers, and let V be an A-vector space. A subset S of V is (usually) said to be absolutely convex if it is an R-submodule of V. On the other hand

$$(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}) \iff \lambda_i \in R, \forall i = 1, ..., n,$$

is an immediate conseguence of the non-archimedean nature of A which implies that $R = A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a subring of A. □

Now we introduce a useful class of bornological rings.

Definition 1.3.12. *Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring. We will say that A is of* convex type *(or that $\mathcal{B}$ is a* convex *bornology) if*

1. *$A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} \in \mathcal{B}$;*
2. *$B \in \mathcal{B} \Rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(B) \in \mathcal{B}$.*

We will denote the full subcategory of **Born**(**Rings**) *given by the class of rings of convex type by* **Born**(**CRings**).

Lemma 1.3.13. *Let $\mathcal{B}_i$ be a family of bornologies on A and $\mathcal{B} = \bigcap \mathcal{B}_i$, then*

$$A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcap A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_i}.$$

Proof. If $x \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$, then $\{x^n\} \in \mathcal{B}_i$ for all i hence $x \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_i}$ for all i, *i.e.* $x \in \bigcap A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_i}$. On the other hand if $x \in \bigcap A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_i}$ then $\{x^n\} \in \mathcal{B}_i$ for all i, *i.e.* $\{x^n\} \in \mathcal{B}$ and so $x \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$. □

Proposition 1.3.14. *Let $\mathcal{B}_i$ be a family of convex bornologies on A, then $\mathcal{B} = \bigcap \mathcal{B}_i$ is a convex bornology on A.*

Proof. By previous lemma $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} \in \mathcal{B}$ and for any $S \subset A$

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(S) = \bigcap \Gamma_{\mathcal{B}_i}(S).$$

Hence if $B \in \mathcal{B}$ then $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(B) \in \mathcal{B}$. □

Definition 1.3.15. *Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring. We say that A is of* bounded convex type *if*

1. *$A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} \in \mathcal{B}$;*
2. *$B \in \mathcal{B}$ implies that $\exists \lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n \in A$, such that*

$$B \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n \lambda_i A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

We will denote the full subcategory of **Born**(**Rings**) *given by the class of rings of convex type by* **Born**(**CBRings**).

The next proposition explain the choice of names.

Proposition 1.3.16. *Let $(A, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological ring of bounded convex type then for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$ we have that $\Gamma(B) \in \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. By definition of ring of bounded convex type we have that $B \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} x_i A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ}$ for some $x_1, ..., x_m \in A$. Applying the definition of absolutely convex hull we have that

$$\Gamma(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} x_i A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ}) = \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_j a_j | (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ}), a_j \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} x_i A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ} \right\} =$$

$$= \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_j x_{i_j} b_j | (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ}), b_j \in A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ} \right\}$$

grouping together the same x_{i_j} we can write

$$\Gamma(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} x_i A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ}) = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{m} x_i \sum_{j_i=0}^{n_i} \lambda_{j_i} b_{j_i} | (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ}), b_j \in A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ} \right\}$$

but by definition $\sum_{j_i=0}^{n_i} \lambda_{j_i} b_{j_i} \in A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ}$ so

$$\Gamma(B) \subset \Gamma(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} x_i A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ}) \subset \sum_{i=0}^{m} x_i A_{\mathcal{B}}^{\circ} \in \mathcal{B}$$

by the definition of bornological ring. □

So every ring bornology of bounded convex type is of convex type, and we see below some examples of convex ring bornologies which are not of bounded convex type. Let M be a multiplicative submonoid of a ring A, *i.e.* $M \leqslant (A, \cdot)$. We can consider the smallest ring bornology for which M is a bounded subset, and we denote it by $\mathcal{B}_M$.

Proposition 1.3.17. *Let M be a multiplicative submonoid of A with $0 \in M$. Then a basis for $\mathcal{B}_M$ is given by the sets of the form*

$$\lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M$$

with $\lambda_i \in A$.

Proof. Since M is a monoid, then for every $a \in A$ we have that $a \in aM$, hence the family of sets $\{aM\}_{a \in A}$ covers A. Next, every ring bornology for which M is a bounded subset the family of subsets

$$\lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M$$

must be bounded. Let's show that they are a basis for a ring bornology. Given two such elements

$$\lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M, \mu_1 M + ... + \mu_r M$$

we have that

$$(\lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M) \cup (\mu_1 M + ... + \mu_r M) \subset \lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M + \mu_1 M + ... + \mu_r M$$

because $0 \in \lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M$ and $0 \in \mu_1 M + ... + \mu_r M$. So this family is a base for a bornology. Moreover this family is closed by addition by definition, so we are left to show that

$$(\lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M)(\mu_1 M + ... + \mu_r M)$$

is a bounded subset for $\mathcal{B}_M$. By the distributivity law of multiplication we have that given $\rho_1 \in \lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M$ and $\rho_2 \in \mu_1 M + ... + \mu_r M$ then

$$\rho_1 \rho_2 = (\lambda_1 m_1 + ... + \lambda_n m_n)(\mu_1 m'_1 + ... + \mu_r m'_r)$$

$$\in \lambda_1 \mu_1 M + ... + \lambda_1 \mu_r M + ... + \lambda_n \mu_1 M + ... + \lambda_n \mu_r M.$$

□

Proposition 1.3.18. *Let M be a multiplicative saturated submonoid of A with $0 \in M$. If $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M} = M$ then $\mathcal{B}_M$ is a ring bornology of convex type.*

Proof. The requests of M being saturated is necessary to have an equality $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M} = M$, because this property is always satisfied by $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ for any ring bornology on A.

By definition a ring is of convex type if its bornology has a basis made of absolutely convex sets. So, let's check that the elements of the basis of $\mathcal{B}_M$ made by the family

$$\lambda_1 M + ... + \lambda_n M$$

with $\lambda_i \in A$ are absolutely convex sets. If $M = A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M}$ we have to check that the subsets

$$\lambda_1 A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M} + ... + \lambda_n A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M}$$

are absolutely convex. So, denoting $B = \lambda_1 A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M} + ... + \lambda_n A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M}$ we have

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}_M}(B) \subset \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i b_i | (\mu_i) \in \mathcal{R}^m(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M}), b_i \in B \right\} \subset \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \lambda_{j_i} a_i | (\mu_i) \in \mathcal{R}^m(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M}), \lambda_{j_i} a_i \in \lambda_{j_i} A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M} \right\}.$$

But we know that $\mu_i a_i = a'_i$ for some $a'_i \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M}$, hence

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}_M}(B) \subset \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_{j_i} b'_i | (\mu_i) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}_M}(A), b'_i \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M} \right\} \subset B,$$

because $(\mu_i) \in \mathcal{R}^m(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M})$. The other inclusion $B \subset \Gamma_{\mathcal{B}_M}(B)$ is always true, hence B is absolutely convex. □

Corollary 1.3.19. *Let A be a ring and $\mathcal{B}$ a ring bornology on A of bounded convex type, then $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_M$ for a saturated multiplicative submonoid M of A with $0 \in M$.*

Proof. If $(A, \mathcal{B})$ is a bornological ring of bounded convex type then $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a saturated multiplicative submonoid of A with $0 \in A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$. So $\mathcal{B}_{A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}}$ is the smallest ring bornology which contains $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{B}_{A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}}$ by definition. □

Example 1.3.20.

1. Let $\mathcal{B}_\infty$ denote the bornology induced on $\mathbb{Q}$ by the archimedean absolute value, then the subsets of the form $\lambda \mathbb{Q}^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_\infty}$, with $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ are a base for $\mathcal{B}_\infty$; hence $\mathcal{B}_\infty$ is of bounded convex type. The same is true for the archimedean bornology over $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{R}$.

2. Let $\mathcal{B}_p$ denote the bornology induced on $\mathbb{Q}$ by the p-adic absolute value, then also $\mathcal{B}_p$ is manifestly of bounded convex type.

3. The trivial bornology $\mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}}$, whose bounded subsets are the finite ones, is always a ring bornology on any ring. If we consider $(\mathbb{Q}, \mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}})$, then this bornology is of bounded convex type because $\mathbb{Q}^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}}} = \{0, \pm 1\}$ and because the family of subsets $\lambda_1 \mathbb{Q}^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}}} \cup ... \cup \lambda_n \mathbb{Q}^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}}}$ is a basis for $\mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}}$ then $(\mathbb{Q}, \mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}})$ is of bounded convex type. Instead for $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}})$ we have that $\mu(\mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C}^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}}}$ has infinite cardinality and hence is not bounded. So $(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}})$ is not a bornological ring of convex type.

4. In general $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_M} \supset M$ strictly: for examples consider the monoids $\{\pm 1\} \cup [-1/2, 1/2] \subset \mathbb{R}$ or $[0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$. They both induce the archimedean bornology $\mathcal{B}_\infty$ on $\mathbb{R}$ and they both don't coincide with the set of power-bounded elements of the bornology they induce.

5. On a seminormed ring the canonical bornology is of bounded convex type if and only if the seminorm is power-multiplicative.

The family of ring bornologies of bounded convex type is more easy to describe and to work with, but is not closed for intersections.

Proposition 1.3.21. *Let $\mathcal{B}_\infty$ be the bornology of $\mathbb{Q}$ induced by the archimedean absolute value and for any p let $\mathcal{B}_p$ be the p-adic one, then*

$$\mathcal{B}_? = \mathcal{B}_\infty \cap \left(\bigcap_{p \ primo} \mathcal{B}_p \right) \neq \mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}}.$$

Proof. Let $p_1, p_2, ...$ be the sequence of prime numbers. Let

$$R = \left\{ \frac{1}{p_1}, \frac{1}{p_2}, ..., \frac{1}{p_n}, ... \right\}.$$

Then for any prime p_n one has that

$$R \subset B(0, p) = \{x \in \mathbb{Q} | |x|_{p_n} \leqslant p_n\}$$

and

$$R \subset [0, 1]$$

so

$$R \in \mathcal{B}_\infty \cap \left(\bigcap_{p \text{ primo}} \mathcal{B}_p \right)$$

But R is of infinite cardinality, hence $R \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{triv}}$. □

So the bornology $\mathcal{B}_?$ is an example of a bornology of convex type which is not of bounded convex type.

Lemma 1.3.22. *The category* **Born**(**CBRings**) *is closed under finite products.*

Proof. Let $(A_1, \mathcal{B}_1), ..., (A_n, \mathcal{B}_n)$ be rings of bounded convex type and $(A, \mathcal{B}) = \prod_i (A_i, \mathcal{B}_i)$ their direct product in **Born**(**Rings**). If $x = (x_i) \in A$ is power-bounded then x_i must be power bounded, by the boundness of the projection maps. On the other hand if x_i is power-bounded for each i then x is power-bounded by the definition of direct product bornology. So, $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} \cong \prod_i (A_i)^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_i}$ as monoids. This show the first condition of definition 1.3.15.

For the second we note that B is a bounded subset in A if and only if B_i (the projection on the ith component) is bounded for each i. This mean that there exist $\lambda_{i,j}$ with $1 \leqslant j \leqslant m_i$ such that

$$B_i \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_i} \lambda_{i,j} (A_i)^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_i}$$

so defining $\Lambda_i = (\lambda_{1,i_1}, ..., \lambda_{n,i_n})$, with $i = (i_1, ..., i_n)$ for $1 \leqslant i_j \leqslant m_j$, then

$$B \subset \prod_{i=1}^{n} B_i \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \Lambda_i A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

□

Lemma 1.3.23. *The category* **Born**(**CBRings**) *is closed under pullbacks.*

Proof. Let $(A, \mathcal{B}) = (A_1, \mathcal{B}_1) \times_{(C, \mathcal{B}_C)} (A_2, \mathcal{B}_2)$ be a pullback of bornological rings. Again $x \in A_1 \times_C A_2$ is power-bounded if and only if $\pi_1(x) \in A_1$ and $\pi_2(x) \in A_2$ are power-bounded (where the π_i are the canonical projections), hence

$$A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} = (A_1)^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_1} \times_{C^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_C}} (A_2)^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_2}$$

set-theoretically. Therefore $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}$ is bounded and if $B \subset A$ is bounded then $\pi_1(B) \subset \bigcup \lambda^n_{i=1}(A_1)^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_1}$ and $\pi_2(B) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} \rho_i(A_2)^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_2}$. Hence there exists $m \cdot n$ elements $\sigma_i \in A$ such that

$$B = \bigcup_{i=0}^{mn} \sigma_i A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

□

Theorem 1.3.24. *The category* **Born**(**CBRings**) *is finitely complete.*

Proof. The theorem is immediate from previuos lemmas. We can also notice that if $(A, \mathcal{B}) = \lim_I (A_i, \mathcal{B}_i)$, where I is a finite diagram, then we also have $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} = \lim_I (A_i)^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_i}$ in the category of monoids. □

We note that in particular given two ring bornologies $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ of bounded convex type on a ring A, then $\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2$ is of bounded convex type.

The data $\{\mathcal{R}^n(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equivalent to the algebraic monad $\Sigma_{A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}}$ canonically associated to the inclusion of monoids $A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}} \hookrightarrow A$, defined in appendix B. Moreover with this interpretation a subset $X \subset A$ is absolutely convex if and only if it is a $\Sigma_{A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}}}$-submodule of A.

So, up to now we showed that given any bounded morphism of bornological rings $f : (A, \mathcal{B}_A) \to (B, \mathcal{B}_B)$ we get the following commutative diagram of maps of monoids

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_A} & \xrightarrow{f^\circ} & B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B} \end{array} .$$

Hence is natural to ask whether this map give rise to a map of monads obtaining the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_A & \xrightarrow{f} & \Sigma_B \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \Sigma_{A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_A}} & \xrightarrow{f^\circ} & \Sigma_{B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B}} \end{array} .$$

In general there is no reason to for which this must be true. So we give the following definition.

Definition 1.3.25. *Let $f : (A, \mathcal{B}_A) \to (B, \mathcal{B}_B)$ be a homomorphism (not necessarily bounded) of bornological rings, we says that f is* strongly bounded *if f induces a map of monads $f^\circ : \Sigma_{A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_A}} \to \Sigma_{B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B}}$.*

Proposition 1.3.26. *Let $f : (A, \mathcal{B}_A) \to (B, \mathcal{B}_B)$ be a bounded homomorphism of bornological rings. If $B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B}$ is a subring of B then f is strongly bounded.*

Proof. It is enough to show that f induces maps $f^n : \Sigma_{A^\circ}(\mathbf{n}) \to \Sigma_{B^\circ}(\mathbf{n})$ for any $\mathbf{n}$. This is clear because for any n we have that $\sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i)x_i \in B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B}$ for any $x_1, ..., x_n \in B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B}$ because $B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B}$ is a subring. □

Remark 1.3.27. The previous proposition shows that the concept of boundedness and strong boundedness coincides in rigid geometry, *i.e.* for maps between rigid affinoid spaces. Fact no more true if we want to study more general algebro-geometric structures.

The next proposition explains our choice of terminology.

Proposition 1.3.28. *Let $f : (A, \mathcal{B}_A) \to (B, \mathcal{B}_B)$ be a homomorphism of rings of bounded convex type. If f is strongly bounded then it is bounded.*

Proof. By hypothesis $f(A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_A}) \subset B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B}$ and so every bounded subset of A is mapped into a bounded subset of B because the family of subsets

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n \lambda_i A^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_A}, \lambda_i \in A, n \in \mathbb{N}$$

form a base for $\mathcal{B}_A$ and the family

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n \lambda_i B^\circ_{\mathcal{B}_B}, \lambda_i \in B, n \in \mathbb{N}$$

form a base for $\mathcal{B}_B$. □

1.4 Bornological modules

In this section A denotes a bornological ring (always commutative with identity) and E denotes an A-module.

Definition 1.4.1. *We say that E is a bornological module over A if E is equipped of a group bornology for which all the maps $(\lambda, x) : (A \times E) \to E$ defined $x \mapsto \lambda x$ are bounded.*

In total analogy with what we did in the previous sections we can define the category of bornological modules over A whose morphism are bounded homomorphism of modules. The results that we discussed for the category of bornological groups easily extends to this category with analogous proves. We only list these properties, without giving proves.

1. The category of bornological modules is complete and cocomplete and the forgetful funtor to the category of modules commutes with both limits and colimits;
2. The category of bornological modules is additive and admits kernel and cokernel;
3. Given a morphism of bornological modules $f : E \to F$ we have that
   (a) $\operatorname{Ker} f = f^{-1}(0)$ endowed with the subspace bornology;
   (b) $\operatorname{Coker} f = F/f(E)$ endowed with the quotient bornology;

(c) $\operatorname{Im} f = f(E)$ endowed with the induced bornology by the inclusion $f(E) \hookrightarrow F$;

(d) $\operatorname{Coim} f = E/f^{-1}(0)$ endowed with the quotient bornology.

4. The concept of strict monomorphism and strict epimorphism coincide with the concept of regular monomorphism and regular epimorphism of bornological sets.

5. The category of bornological modules is quasi-abelian.

In the next chapter we recall the rich theory of bornological vector spaces over a valued field.

Definition 1.4.2. *We say that a bornological module E over A is of* convex type *if it admit a base of absolutely convex subsets.*

1.5 The language of halos

We recall here some definitions and methods used by Paugam in [47], which will be useful in next sections.

Definition 1.5.1. *A* halo *is a semiring A whose underlying set is equipped with a partial order $\leqslant$ which is compatible with its operations: $x \leqslant z$ and $y \leqslant t$ implies $xy \leqslant zt$ and $x + y \leqslant z + t$. A* morphism *between two halos is an increasing map $f : A \to B$ which is submultiplicative,* i.e. $f(1) = 1$ *and*

$$f(ab) \leqslant f(a)f(b) \forall a, b \in A$$

and subadditive, i.e. $f(0) = 0$ *and*

$$f(a + b) \leqslant f(a) + f(b) \forall a, b \in A.$$

A halo morphism is called

- square-multiplicative *if $f(a^2) = f(a)^2$ for all $a \in A$;*
- power-multiplicative *if $f(a^n) = f(a)^n$ for all $a \in A$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- multiplicative *if $f(ab) = f(a)f(b)$ for all $a, b \in A$.*

The class of halos with halo morphisms form a category that is denoted **Halos**.

Lemma 1.5.2. *On a ring A there exists only one halo structure, up to isomorphisms, given by the trivial order.*

Proof. [47] □

Remark 1.5.3. We notice that this lemma don't only implies that there exists a canonical functor that embeds the category of rings in the category of halos, but also that this functor is fully faithful. Indeed, the subadditivity and submultiplicativity conditions become equalities for the trivial order.

In the next definition we change a little the names used in [47].

Definition 1.5.4. *Let R be an halo. We say that R is*

- positive, *if $0 < 1$;*
- *a* pre-aura, *if R is a semifield,* i.e. *if $R - \{0\}$ is a group for the multiplication operation;*

- *an* aura*, if R is a positive pre-aura whose order is total;*
- tropical*, if it's totally ordered and $\forall a, b \in R$ we have that $a + b = \max\{a, b\}$.*

Definition 1.5.5. *Let A be a ring and R an aura. A (generalized)* seminorm *on A with values on R is a halos morphism $|\cdot| : A \to R$.*

In the following we use the language of halos as a shortcut to deal at the same time with archimedean and non-archimedean norms over algebras. In particular when we will deal with an algebra A over a non-archimedean valued field k, we (tacitly) equip $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ with his tropical aura structure in order to obtain from the triangle inequality $|a + b| \leqslant |a| + |b|$ required in the definition of seminorm, the strong triangle inequality $|a + b| = \max\{|a|, |b|\}$. Moreover this will be handy in dealing with power-series over k and the summation norm on $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i X^i \in k[\![X]\!]$ which will be formally written

$$\| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i X^i \| = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_i|$$

but whose meaning is different with respect to the halos structure considered on $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$. If we are working on an archimedean valued field the summation symbol stands for the usual addition between real numbers while if we are dealing with a non-archimedean one it stands for tropical addition. Finally, we remark that when we deal with algebras over a non-archimedean valued field, this convention implies that we work in a full subcategory of the category of seminormed algebras, avoiding to consider the "pathological" objects which are endowed with a seminorm which doesn't satisfies the ultrametric triangle inequality even if they are over a non-archimedean valued field. This is a point to have in mind to state the right universal properties of the algebras that we will study in the following chapter by working in the right category.

Chapter 2

Bornological spectra and power-series

2.1 Spectra of bornological algebras of convex type

Let $(k, |\cdot|)$ be a fixed field complete with respect a non-trivial absolute value $|\cdot| : k \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$. From now on, all vector spaces and algebras are defined over k.

Definition 2.1.1. *A vector space E over k is said to be* a bornological vector space *if on E is defined a bornology compatible with the structure of vector space,* i.e. *the vector sum and the multiplication by scalar are bounded maps, where on k we consider the canonical bornology given by $|\cdot|$. In other words, E is a bornological module over the bornological ring $(k, \mathcal{B}_{|\cdot|})$.*

As we saw so far the category of bornological vector spaces is complete and cocomplete.

Definition 2.1.2. *A bornological vector space E over k is said of* convex type *if there exists a base for the bornology consisting of absolutely convex subsets of E.*

This is equivalent to say that E is a filtered inductive limit, calculated in the category of bornological vector spaces, of seminormed vector spaces (equipped with their canonical bornology derived by the seminorm) as shown by Houzel in [19]. More precisely, the category of bornological vector spaces of convex type is equivalent to the full subcategory defined by the essentially monomorphic objects in the category of **Ind**-objects of the category of seminormed spaces, cf. [21].

Notation 2.1.3. We denote by $(\mathcal{LCV})_k$ the category of locally convex topological vector spaces over k with morphisms continuous homomorphisms of vector spaces. And with $(\mathcal{BVC})_k$ the category bornological vector spaces of convex type over k with morphisms bounded homomorphisms of vector spaces.

We recall that Houzel in [19] has defined two functors ${}^b : (\mathcal{LCV})_k \to (\mathcal{BVC})_k$ and ${}^t : (\mathcal{BVC})_k \to (\mathcal{LCV})_k$ and he has shown that these functors are adjoints. We recall briefly how these functors are defined: let $(E, \mathcal{T})$ be a locally convex topological vector space, the *canonical bornology* on E is defined by the family of subset $B \subset E$ such that for any open neighborhood of 0 there exists a $\lambda \in k^\times$ with $B \subset \lambda U$; *i.e.* the bounded subsets are the subsets absorbed by any open neighborhood of $0 \in E$. It's easy to check that this family of subsets gives to E the structure of a bornological vector space which is of convex type. This association is functorial and is precisely the definition of the functor ^{b}, *i.e.* $(E, \mathcal{T})^b$ is the bornological vector space obtained equipping E with the canonical (also called Von

Neumann) bornology. On the other hand, if we have a bornological vector space of convex type $(E, \mathcal{B})$ then the family of subsets which absorb all the bounded subsets of E is a filter of neighborhoods of 0 which induces a topology on E which gives to E a structure of locally convex topological vector space. The association of this topology is functorial, and is denoted by $(E, \mathcal{B})^t$.

Definition 2.1.4. *A bornological vector space E over k of convex type is said to be* normal *if $(E^t)^b \cong E$. The same definition is given for a locally convex space E, which is* normal *if $(E^b)^t \cong E$.*

The full subcategories of normal bornological and topological vector spaces are equivalent by mean of the functors ^{b} and ^{t}. This subcategories are very useful since they are the categories where the concepts of boundedness and of continuity of a linear map are equivalent.

Example 2.1.5.

1. Metrizable, bornological or topological, vector spaces are normal.
2. Normal topological vector spaces are what Bourbaki [1] calls "bornological vector spaces".
3. In next chapters we will work with LF-spaces (sometimes called generalized LF-spaces, when the term LF-space is reserved for what other authors call strict LF-space; we follow the nomenclature of calling strict LF-space the one defined by systems with strict morphism and use LF-space otherwise), defined as countable filtrant (cf. below) direct limits of Fréchet spaces, and very often LB-space *i.e.* countable filtrant direct limits of Banach spaces. On these spaces one can put canonically the locally convex direct limit topology which has the main drawback to being complicated and difficult to deal with. For example it's known that no LB-space (our main object of study in the following) is metrizable as topological vector space. This implies that the family of neighborhoods of zero is not countable. We can simplify the handling of such spaces equipping them with the direct limit bornology, which has a countable base, it's easy to describe and contain the same amount of information of the direct limit locally convex topology.
4. Our main example of LB-space is the Washnitzer-Monsky algebra defined by Grosse-Klönne [33] as the colimit
$$W_k^n = \varinjlim_{\substack{\rho>1 \\ \rho\in\sqrt{|k^\times|}}} T_k^n(\rho)$$
where $T_k^n(\rho)$ are the Tate algebras for the disk of radius ρ for a non-archimedean field k. As we said the inductive limit topology is non-metrizable. We will see in the following that W_k^n is a complete and LF-regular (*i.e.* normal) LB-space.

So, on a normal bornological vector space we don't lose any information by considering the canonical locally convex topology and viceversa. A common issue when dealing with the functors ^{b} and ^{t} is whether they commute with some particular kind of limits or colimits. From Houzel [19] we quote this result.

Proposition 2.1.6. *Let $\{E_i\}_{i\in I}$ be any directed family of bornological vector spaces of convex type then*

1. $(\varinjlim E_i)^t \cong \varinjlim E_i^t$;
2. *if $I = \mathbb{N}$, with the canonical order, and the morphisms $E_{n+1} \to E_n$ are strict epimorphisms then $(\varprojlim E_i)^t \cong \varprojlim E_i^t$.*

Let $\{E_i\}_{i\in I}$ be any directed family of locally convex topological vector spaces then

1. $(\varprojlim E_i)^b \cong \varprojlim E_i^b$;
2. *if $I = \mathbb{N}$, with the canonical order, and the morphisms $E_n \to E_{n+1}$ are closed strict monomorphisms then* $(\varinjlim E_i)^b \cong \varinjlim E_i^b$.

Proof. [19] pages 104-105. □

This proposition is not enough for our purpose and we will need more sophisticated results. The following property explains why bornological vector spaces are suitable for studying direct limits of seminormed spaces.

Proposition 2.1.7. *The forgetful functor $(\mathcal{BVC})_k \to \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Mod}_k)$ from the category of bornological vector spaces of convex type to the category of bornological vector spaces commutes with colimits.*

Proof. □

The previous property is in contrast with the situation that one meet in the theory of locally convex topological vector space for which the forgetful functor to the category of topological vector spaces commutes with limits and not with colimits making hard to understand direct limit locally convex topologies.

We recall now some results and definitions about the concepts of completeness on bornological vector spaces from [19].

Definition 2.1.8. *Let E be a k-vector space and $A \subset E$ an absolutely convex subset. We can associate to A the* gauge *or* Minkowski functional $\mu_A : E \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ *defined by*

$$\mu_A(x) \doteq \inf_{\lambda\in k} \{|\lambda| | x \in \lambda A\},$$

which is a seminorm. We denote E_A the vector subspace of E generated by A equipped with the seminorm given by the gauge of A.

We have that for a bornological vector space of convex type there is a canonical isomorphism $E \cong \varinjlim E_A$, where A varies over the family of bounded absolutely convex subsets of E.

Definition 2.1.9. *Let $E = \varinjlim E_A$ be a bornological vector space of convex type. We say that E is* complete *if each of the E_A is a complete normed vector space. We say that E is* separated *if each E_A is normed.*

There are several equivalent characterization of bornological completeness (see [19]). The one that we need is the following.

Proposition 2.1.10. *A bornological vector space of convex type is complete if and only if*

$$E \cong \varinjlim_{i\in I} E_i$$

where E_i is a filtered system of complete normable bornological vector spaces and the morphism of the system are all injective.

Proof. [19] page 96. □

It's known [19] that if E is a complete locally convex vector space then E^b is a complete bornological vector space. But is possibile that E^b is bornologically complete even if E is not complete.

Definition 2.1.11. *A bornological vector space A over k equipped with a bilinear function $A \times A \to A$, called multiplication map, is said a* bornological k-algebra *if the multiplication map is bounded. We always suppose that A has an identity and that the multiplication is commutative. A morphism of bornological algebras is a bounded linear map that preserve multiplication and maps 1 to 1. We denote by $\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ the category of bornological algebras over k.*

Hence we have an inclusion functor $\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Rings})$ which is a full embedding. This functor commutes with any kind of limit and colimit. We can compose functors $\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Rings}) \overset{\circ}{\to} \mathbf{Monoids}$, so given an element $A \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k))$ we will write

$$A^\circ \doteq \left\{ f \in A | \{f, f^2, ...\} \text{ is bounded} \right\}$$

for the subset of *power-bounded* elements of A.

Definition 2.1.12. *A bornological algebra $A \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k))$ is said* multiplicatively convex *if*

$$A \cong \varinjlim A_i$$

in the category of bornological algebras, with A_i seminormed spaces.

Remark 2.1.13. The subtle and important request in the previous definition is that the maps of the system $\varinjlim A_i$ are required to be algebras morphisms and not only linear maps!

Notation 2.1.14. We fix notation once for all, because we will use many times inductive systems of seminormed algebras. For any diagram $F : I \to \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ we denote by $\varphi_{i,j}$ the morphisms $\varphi_{i,j} : F(i) \to F(j)$ for any $i, j \in I$ (if there is any). The notation is unambiguous since all systems that we use are such that for $i, j \in I$ there is at most one morphism. We denote by $\alpha_i : A_i \to \varinjlim A_i$ the canonical morphisms of the colimit.

Moreover, we say that the colimit $\varinjlim A_i$ is *filtered* if the diagram $F : I \to \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ is directed, and we say that is *filtrant* if $F : I \to \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ is linearly ordered and each map $\varphi_{i,j}$ is a monomorphism.

Definition 2.1.15. *Let A be a multiplicatively convex bornological algebra we say that A is* complete *if there is an isomorphism*

$$A \cong \varinjlim A_i$$

where the system morphisms $\varphi_{i,j}$ are monomorphisms and A_i are k-Banach algebras.

We denote by $\widehat{\mathbf{Born}}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ the full subcategory of $\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ composed by the complete multiplicatively convex bornological algebras. By proposition 2.1.10 this implies that the underlying vector space of A is a complete bornological vector space. The inclusion $\widehat{\mathbf{Born}}(\mathbf{Alg}_k) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ commutes with any kind of limit but doesn't commute with colimits in general. Hence to describe colimits in $\widehat{\mathbf{Born}}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ we need the complete bornological tensor product and write

$$A \widehat{\otimes}_k B$$

for $A, B \in \widehat{\mathbf{Born}}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$, obtained taking the completion of $A \otimes_k B$ equipped with the projective tensor product bornology (cf. [19]). It is clear that this bornology gives to $A \widehat{\otimes}_k B$ the universal property of the coproduct in $\widehat{\mathbf{Born}}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ because the projective tensor product bornology is by definition the strongest tensor product bornology.

Definition 2.1.16. *Let A be a bornological vector space. We say that a seminorm $\|\cdot\| : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ is* bounded *if it is bounded as map in the category of bornological sets, with $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ equipped with the canonical metric bornology.*

Definition 2.1.17. *Let A be a bornological algebra. The* bornological spectrum *(or simply the spectrum) of A is the set $\mathcal{M}(A)$ of all bounded multiplicative seminorms, compatible with the valuation on k, equipped with the weakest topology such that all maps $\mathcal{M}(A) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ defined $\|\cdot\| \mapsto \|f\|$, for $f \in A$, are continuous.*

Remark 2.1.18. By saying compatible with the vatuation on k we mean that the restriction of the elements of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ to k is *equal* to the valuation on k.

Note that if A is a seminormed k-algebra this is equivalent to usual definition *i.e.* to the definition of Berkovich spectrum. In fact let $(A, |\cdot|_1)$ be a seminormed algebra over k and $|\cdot|_2 : A \to \mathbb{R}_+$ a seminorm. The classical definition says that $|\cdot|_2$ is bounded with respect to $|\cdot|_1$ if there exist a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|f|_2 \leqslant C|f|_1$$

for all $f \in A$. This implies that if $B \subset A$ is bounded for $|\cdot|_1$ there must exists a $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$|f|_1 \leqslant \rho$$

for each $f \in B$, so

$$|f|_2 \leqslant \rho C$$

for f varying in B. This mean that each bounded subset, with respect to $|\cdot|_1$, is mapped to a bounded subset in $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ by $|\cdot|_2$, *i.e.* $|\cdot|_2$ is a bounded map of bornological sets.

On the other hand suppose that the bornology induced by $|\cdot|_2$ is coarser than the bornology induced by $|\cdot|_1$. This mean that each bounded subset for $|\cdot|_1$ is bounded for $|\cdot|_2$. Then we have

$$|D_{|\cdot|_1}(0, 1^+)|_2 \subset [0, C]$$

for some $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (where with $D_{|\cdot|_1}$ we denote disks for $|\cdot|_1$). So, this mean that

$$|f|_2 \leqslant C$$

for each $f \in D_{|\cdot|_1}(0, 1^+)$. Given an arbitrary $f \in A$, then we can always find a $\lambda \in k$ such that $|\lambda| = |\lambda|_1 = |f|_1$ (changing $|\cdot|_1$ with a solid equivalent seminorm if necessary if k is non-archimedean). Hence

$$\lambda^{-1} f \in D_{|\cdot|_1}(0, 1^+) \Rightarrow |\lambda^{-1} f|_2 \leqslant C$$

so

$$|f|_2 \leqslant C|\lambda|_2 = C|\lambda|_1 = C|f|_1$$

because by compatibility the condition $|\lambda|_2 = |\lambda|_1 = |\lambda|$.

Hence, when we talk of seminorms on a bornological algebra we always assume that the seminorm is compatible with the valuation of the field on which the space is defined.

Remark 2.1.19. In general the definition that we gave of bounded seminorm is not equivalent to the classical definition over a general normed ring. Let's consider for example $\mathbb{Z}$ and on it the trivial valuation $|\cdot|_0$ and a p-adic one $|\cdot|_p$ for a prime p. If we look at them as maps of bornological sets and consider their pullback of the bornology of $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ on $\mathbb{Z}$ we see that both $|\cdot|_0$ and $|\cdot|_p$ induces the chaotic bornology. So they induces the same bornology on $\mathbb{Z}$.

If now we apply the classical definition of boundedness, in one case we see that $|n|_p \leqslant 1$ for every $n \neq 0$ so

$$|n|_p \leqslant |n|_0$$

for every n, hence $|\cdot|_p$ is bounded with respect to $|\cdot|_0$ in the usual sense. But on the other hand

$$|p^n|_p = \frac{1}{p^n}$$

can be arbritrarily near to 0 so there does not exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|n|_0 \leqslant C|n|_p$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Let's denote by $\mathcal{U} : \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k) \to \mathbf{Born}$ the forgetful functor from the category of bornological algebras to the category of bornological sets.

Lemma 2.1.20. *Let*

$$A = \varinjlim(A_i, |\cdot|_i)$$

be a bornological multiplicatively convex algebra, which satisfies the condition

$$\varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i) \cong \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i),$$

then a compatible seminorm $\|\cdot\| : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ is bounded if and only if $\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i$ is bounded for each $|\cdot|_i$.

Proof. Let $\|\cdot\| : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ be a bounded seminorm and let $\alpha_i : A_i \to A$ be the canonical morphisms. $\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i$ is a seminorm on A_i and since it is a composition of bounded maps, it is bounded.

Now let $\|\cdot\| : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ be a seminorm such that $\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i$ is bounded for every i. This condition readily implies that $\|\cdot\|$ is compatible because for any i, and any $x \in k$, $\|x\| = \|\alpha_i(x)\| = |x|$, for the canonical inclusions $k \hookrightarrow A$ and $k \hookrightarrow A_i$. We have the following maps of bornological sets

$$A_i \xrightarrow{\alpha_i'} \varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i) \xrightarrow{J} \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i) \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}.$$

By the universal property of the direct limit $J \circ \|\cdot\|$ is bounded if and only if $\alpha_i' \circ J \circ \|\cdot\|$ are bounded for each i. The same is true for $\|\cdot\|$ if J is an isomorphism of plain bornological sets. □

Note that this property may fail if $\varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i) \ncong \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i)$. The interesting case we have in mind is the following.

Corollary 2.1.21. *Let*

$$A = \varinjlim(A_i, |\cdot|_i)$$

be a bornological multiplicatively convex algebra, where the limit is filtrant, then a compatible seminorm $\|\cdot\| : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ is bounded if and only if $\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i$ is bounded for each $|\cdot|_i$ (where $\alpha_i : A_i \to A$ are the canonical morphisms).

Proof. □

In general one has the following.

Proposition 2.1.22. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be bornological multiplicatively convex algebra, then*

$$\varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i) \cong \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i),$$

if and only if the limit $\varinjlim A_i$ is filtered.

Proof. The category of bornological algebras admit a forgetful functor to the category of rings. This functor commute with limits and colimits since to do the calculation of these in the category of bornological algebras one calculate the limit in the category of rings and put the initial or final bornology, required by the universal property. And the forgetful functor from the category of ring to the category of sets commutes with colimits precisely when they are filtered, therefore the same is true for bornological algebras. □

Lemma 2.1.23. *Let*

$$A = \varinjlim (A_i, |\cdot|_i)$$

be a multiplicatively convex bornological algebra such that $\varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i) \cong \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i)$. A compatible seminorm $\|\cdot\| : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ is multiplicative if and only if $\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i$ is multiplicative for any i.

Proof. Let $\|\cdot\| : A \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a multiplicative seminorm, then $\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i$ is multiplicative, since α_i is an algebra morphism.

Suppose each $\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i$ is multiplicative. This mean that

$$(\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i)(xy) = (\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i)x(\|\cdot\| \circ \alpha_i)y$$

i.e.

$$\|\alpha_i(xy)\| = \|\alpha_i(x)\|\|\alpha_i(y)\| \Rightarrow \|\alpha_i(x)\alpha_i(y)\| = \|\alpha_i(x)\|\|\alpha_i(y)\|$$

and the condition $\varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i) \cong \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i)$ ensure that any $x, y \in A$ are in the set-theoretic image of some A_i, and hence the assertion of the lemma follows. □

The next is our main result about spectra of bornological algebras.

Theorem 2.1.24. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a multiplicatively convex bornological algebra for which*

$$\varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i) \cong \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i).$$

Then, $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is a non-empty compact Hausdorff topological space.

Proof. By the previous lemmas to give an element $\|\cdot\| \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ is equivalent to give a system of bounded multiplicative seminorms $|\cdot|_i : A_i \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that

$$|\cdot|_j \circ \varphi_{i,j} = |\cdot|_i$$

where $\varphi_{i,j}$ are the morphisms of the system. The association $A_i \mapsto \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ is contravariantly functorial (see Berkovich [28]) hence to the system $\varinjlim A_i$ we can associate the projective system $\varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$, where the maps of the system are the continuous map obtained by the pullback by $\varphi_{i,j}$, as above. So, to give a bounded multiplicative seminorm on A is equivalent to give a an element

$$\|\cdot\| \in \varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$$

since by previous lemmas these elements are in 1 to 1 correspondence with multiplicative, bounded seminorms on A which are compatible with the valuation on k.

Giving to $\varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ the limit topology ensure that for each $\|\cdot\| \in \varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ the map $\|\cdot\| \mapsto \|f\|$ is continuous for each $f \in A$, since is true for a cofinal part of the system. Moreover, topologically

$$\mathcal{M}(A) \cong \varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$$

because the universal property of $\varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$, with the projective limit topology, coincides with that of the weak topology.

More precisely, the maps $\|\cdot\| \mapsto \|f\|$ factors

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i) & & \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_i} & \searrow^{\|\cdot\| \mapsto \|f\|} & \\ \mathcal{M}(A_i) & \xrightarrow[|\cdot|_i \mapsto |f|_i]{} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

in a cofinal part of the limit, and we know that $(|\cdot|_i \mapsto |f|_i) \circ \pi_i$ is continuous, therefore the identity $\varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i) \to \mathcal{M}(A)$ is continuous by the definition of weak topology.

On the other hand, the association $\|\cdot\| \mapsto \alpha_i^*(|\cdot|_i)$ is a continuous map $\mathcal{M}(A) \to \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ and so the identity $\mathcal{M}(A) \to \varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ is a continuous map, by the universal property of the limit.

Finally, since $\mathcal{M}(A_i)$ are compact Hausdorff spaces (they are the Berkovich spectra) and they are non-empty because A_i are k-algebras, it follows that $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is compact Hausdorff too and is non-empty because all the map are closed (because they are continuous map between compat Hausdorff spaces) and in this situation non-emptiness of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ follows from a general result of A.H. Stone, [48]. □

Definition 2.1.25. *Let A be a bornological algebra over k. We will say that A has* well defined spectrum *if*

1. *A is multiplicatively convex;*
2. *there exists a presentation $A \cong \varinjlim A_i$, with A_i seminormed, such that $\varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i) \cong \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i)$.*

Remark 2.1.26. Recall that for A being multiplicatively convex means that there exists an isomorphism $A \cong \varinjlim A_i$, with A_i seminormed k-algebras, without requiring that the limit is filtered. Hence A may not, in general, admit a presentation of the form $A \cong \varinjlim B_i$, with B_i seminormed algebras, with at the same time the limit being directed *and* with morphism that are algebra morphisms.

Corollary 2.1.27. *Let A be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum and B another algebra for which there exists a bornological isomorphism $A \cong B$. Then, $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is homeomorphic to $\mathcal{M}(B)$;* i.e. *$\mathcal{M}(A)$ depends only on the isomorphism class of A and not on the representation of A as a direct limit of normed algebras.*

Proof. The definition of the spectrum of A depends only on the isomorphism class of A. □

In [20] Houzel introduced the following definition.

Definition 2.1.28. *Let A be a bornological algebra, the* spectral radius *of $x \in A$ is defined to be the number*

$$q_A(x) \doteq \inf \{|\lambda| | \lambda \in k, x \in \lambda A^\circ\}.$$

Then in [20] is shown the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1.29. *Let A be a (not necessarily commmutative) multiplicatively convex bornological algebra and $x, y \in A$ such that $xy = yx$, then*

$$q_A(x+y) \leqslant q_A(x) + q_A(y)$$

$$q_A(x)q_A(y) \leqslant q_A(x)q_A(y)$$

$$q_A(x^n) = q_A(x)^n$$

and $q_A(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in A$ i.e. *q_A is a seminorm.*

Proof. □

And then one can define the *spectral seminorm of A* as the seminorm q_A. One of the more interesting properties of q_A is the following.

Proposition 2.1.30. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be algebra which is a filtrant strict direct limit of normed bornological algebras then*

$$q_A(x) = \inf q_{A_i}(x).$$

Proof. [20], Corollary of proposition 3, page 19. □

We would like to conclude that, at least under some suitable hypothesis, for any $f \in A$ one has $q_A(f) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}(A)} |f(x)|$. But this is false in the following interesting case. Let

$$W^n_{\mathbb{Q}_p} = \varinjlim_{\rho > 1} T^n_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\rho)$$

be the n-dimensional Washnitzer-Monsky over $\mathbb{Q}_p$. We will see in next sections that $\mathcal{M}(W^n_{\mathbb{Q}_p}) \cong \mathcal{M}(T^n_{\mathbb{Q}_p})$. Now for the sake of simplicity suppose $n = 1$ and let's take $X \in W_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ the variable, we have that

$$|X|_{\sup} = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}(W^n_{\mathbb{Q}_p})} |X(x)| = 1.$$

But since the valuation group of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ is a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}_+$ then

$$q_{W_{\mathbb{Q}_p}}(X) > 1$$

because $X \notin W^\circ_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ and $X \notin T_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(\rho)^\circ$ for any $\rho > 1$, hence $q_{W_{\mathbb{Q}_p}}(X) = p$. Therefore we give the following definition of spectral norm.

Definition 2.1.31. *Let A be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum then we define for all $f \in A$*

$$\rho_A(f) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}(A)} |f(x)|$$

and we call it the spectral radius *fo f and the association $\rho_A : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ the spectral seminorm.*

Remark 2.1.32. Since we showed that $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is compact then $\rho_A(f) = \max_{x \in \mathcal{M}(A)} |f(x)| < \infty$, is well defined.

The association $A \mapsto \mathcal{M}(A)$ is functorial (in the category of bornological algebras with well defined spectrum) because, given a bounded map $\phi : A \to B$ between two bornological algebras with well defined spectrum and a bounded seminorm $|\cdot| : B \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ then $|\cdot| \circ \phi$ is a bounded seminorm on A because composition of bounded maps is a bounded map. So, $\mathcal{M}$ is a contravariant functor to the category of topological spaces.

Let A be a bornological algebra for which the spectrum is well defined. Take a point $x = |\cdot| \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. Since $\mathrm{Ker}\,(|\cdot|)$ is a prime ideal of A, we can extend $|\cdot|$ to $A/\mathrm{Ker}\,(|\cdot|)$, then to the field of fractions and finally take the completion of it which is denoted $\mathcal{H}(x)$. So we get a bounded homomorphism $A \to \mathcal{H}(x)$ to a complete valued field, *i.e.* a character of A.

On the other hand given a character $A \to \mathcal{H}$ to complete valued field, this homomorphism must factor through a prime ideal of A and it gives an element of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ composing the norm of $\mathcal{H}$ with the character. It is clear that two points $x = |\cdot|, x' = |\cdot|' \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ are equal if and only if they define the same equivalence class of characters *i.e.* if and only if they have the same kernel and there is an isometric embedding $\mathcal{H}(x) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}(x')$ for which the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\chi_x} & \mathcal{H}(x) \\ & \searrow^{\chi_{x'}} & \downarrow \\ & & \mathcal{H}(x') \end{array}$$

commutes. Hence we can interpret the bornological spectrum as the set of equivalence classes of bounded character in the same way as one can do with Berkovich spectrum. This identification is not only set-theoretical but also topological since the weak topology that we gave to $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is transferred by this bijection to the weak topology induced by the characters (because it is true for the spectrum of any seminormed algebra A_i which defines A).

Let's see some key examples of bornological spectra.

Example 2.1.33. 1. We saw in a previous example the Washnitzer-Monsky algebra

$$W_k^n = \lim_{\substack{\rho > 1 \\ \rho \in \sqrt{k^\times}}} T_k^n(\rho).$$

This algebra fulfils all the request of the theorem 2.1.24 hence we can associate to W_k^n its bornological spectrum, which turns out to be homemorphic to the Berkovich spectrum of $T_k^n(1)$.

2. By mean of the theory of dagger affinoid algebras, developed by Grosse-Klönne, we can see that to every dagger affinoid algebra A we can associate its bornological spectrum. This give us a Berkovich-like spectrum which is homeomorphic to the topological space of the Berkovich analytic germ associated to A as done by Berkovich in [27]. We will say more about our construction and Berkovich analytic germs in the next chapter.

3. Fréchet algebras are bornological algebras but they are not of multiplicatively convex type. We will show this later how to deal with spectra of locally convex algebras.

4. In general the spectrum of a bornological algebra can be empty. We borrow an example of such an algebra from [13] (in that work A is considered as an LF-algebra). Let A_n be the set of analytic function on $\mathbb{C} - \mathbb{D}(n^+)$, the complement of the closed disk of radius n in $\mathbb{C}$. We equip A_n with the canonical Fréchet structure given by the family of norms

$$|f|_{k,n} \doteq \sup_{n + \frac{1}{k} \leqslant |z| \leqslant n+k} |f(z)|$$

for any $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. So,

$$A \doteq \varinjlim A_n$$

is studied in [13] as an LF-algebra, where is shown that $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is empty. Notice that the canonical morphisms $A_n \hookrightarrow A_{n+1}$ are not strict, so we cannot apply the proposition 2.1.6 to deduce that the bornological spectrum of A coincide with the classical spectrum of LF-algebra. But the fact that in this case the limit commutes is the statement of proposition 15 of [13], hence A is a normal bornological/topological vector space (but not metrizable!). So a character $A \to \mathbb{C}$ is bounded if and only if it is continuous which implies that the LF-spectrum and the bornological spectrum coincide and are both empty. This shows also that A is not a multiplicatively convex bornological algebra *i.e.* A cannot be presented as a direct limit $A \cong \varinjlim B_i$ with B_i normed algebras where the morphism of the system are algebras morphism.

5. We can generalize the previous example to any family of open subsets $U_i \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and such that $U_i \supset U_{i+1}$ and $\bigcap U_i = \varnothing$, and considering the algebra

$$A \doteq \varinjlim \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n}(U_i).$$

As another one dimensional example one can take

$$U_i = \{z \in \mathbb{C} | 0 < |z| < \frac{1}{i}\}.$$

So, let's study some properties of the spectral seminorm.

Definition 2.1.34. *Let A be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum, then $f \in A$ is said* spectrally power-bounded *if $f \in (A, \rho_A)^\circ$. We denote the set of spectrally power-bounded elements by A^s.*

Proposition 2.1.35. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum such that every morphism $\mathcal{M}(A_i) \to \mathcal{M}(A_j)$, for $j \leqslant i$, is injective then $A^\circ \subset A^s$.*

Proof. Since in this case $\varinjlim A_i^\circ = A^\circ$ (lemma 2.1.46) then $f \in A^\circ$ implies $f \in A_i^\circ$ for some i. Since the maps are injective we have that

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \bigcap \mathcal{M}(A_i)$$

so we obtain that $|f(x)| \leqslant 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. □

Theorem 2.1.36. *The association $A \mapsto (A, \rho_A)$ is a functor from the category of complete bornological algebras with well defined spectrum with injective morphisms $\mathcal{M}(A_i) \to \mathcal{M}(A_j)$, for $j \leqslant i$, to the category of seminormed algebras.*

Proof. Since $A^\circ \subset A^s = (A, \rho_A)^\circ$ all the maps $A_i \to (A, \rho_A)$ are bounded. This gives a system of maps $\mathcal{M}((A, \rho_A)) \cong \mathcal{M}(A) \to \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ which shows that the identity map $A \to (A, \rho_A)$ is bounded. Finally, given a bounded map between complete bornological algebras which satisfy the above hypothesis $\phi : A \to B$ then for any $f \in A$ we have that $\rho_B(\phi(f)) \leqslant \rho_A(f)$ because ϕ induces a map of spectra $\phi^* : \mathcal{M}(B) \to \mathcal{M}(A)$ and so

$$\rho_B(\phi(f)) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}(B)} |(f \circ \phi)(x)| = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}(B)} |f(\phi^*(x))| \leqslant \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}(A)} |f(x)|,$$

which shows that $\phi : (A, \rho_A) \to (B, \rho_B)$ is bounded. □

2.1.1 Bornological convergence and topologically nilpotent elements

We need now to recall some definitions from [19] to handle the concept of convergence on bornological vector spaces.

Definition 2.1.37. *Let E be a bornological k-vector space and Φ a filter of subsets of E. We say that* Φ converges to 0 in the sense of Mackey *if there exists a bounded subset $B \subset E$ such that for every $\lambda \in k^\times$ we have that $\lambda B \in \Phi$. We say that Φ converges to $a \in E$ if $\Phi - a$ converge to* 0.

The previous definition applies in particular to the filter associated to a sequence.

Definition 2.1.38. *Let E be a bornological k-vector space we say that a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset E$ is of* Cauchy-Mackey *if the double sequence $\{x_n - x_m\}_{n,m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero in the sense of Mackey. We say that E is* semi-complete *if all sequences of Cauchy-Mackey of E have a limit in E.*

A complete bornological vector space is semi-complete but the converse is not true in general.

Definition 2.1.39. *Let A be a bornological algebra, we say that $a \in A$ is* topologically nilpotent *if the sequence*

$$\{a, a^2, a^3, ...\}$$

converges to 0 *in the sense of Mackey.*

We denote by $A^{\circ\circ}$ the set of topologically nilpotent elements of A. We notice that $A^{\circ\circ}$ is a multiplicative subsemigroup of A because given $a, b \in A^{\circ\circ}$ then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}(ab)^n = \lim_{n\to\infty} a^n \lim_{n\to\infty} b^n = 0$$

because the multiplication is a bounded map. We also notice that $A^{\circ\circ} \subset A^\circ$ because if $a \in A^{\circ\circ}$ from the definition of bornological convergence follows that there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\{a^n\}_{n\geqslant N} \subset B$$

for a bounded subset $B \subset A$, hence $\{a^n\}$ is bounded (because is the union of a bounded subset and a finite subset). Moreover, the image of a topologically nilpotent element by a bounded map is topologically nilpotent, because in general if $\phi : A \to B$ is a bounded map of bornological algebras and $\{a_n\} \subset A$ is a bornologically convergent sequence, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \phi(a_n) = \phi(\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n).$$

And this show that the association $A \mapsto A^{\circ\circ}$ is a functor from the category of bornological algebras to the category of commutative semigroups.

Definition 2.1.40. *Let E be a bornological k-vector space and $X \subset E$ a subset. We say that X is* (bornologically) closed *in E if for any sequence $\{f_1, f_2, ...\}$ of elements of X which have a bornological limit in E, the limit is an element of X. The closure of a subset $X \subset E$ is defined to be the intersection of all closed subsets that contain X.*

Definition 2.1.41. *Let E be a bornological k-vector space, E is said* separated *if $\{0\}$ is a bornologically closed subset of E.*

The closure of a subset is a closed subset and the intersection of any family of closed subsets is a closed subset, as usual. The next is a useful property.

Proposition 2.1.42. *Let E be a bornological k-vector space and $F \subset E$ a vector subspace, then F is closed if and only if E/F is separated.*

Proof. [19]. □

We can restate the previous proposition by saying that closed subspaces of E are in bijection with kernels of homomorphisms from E to separated bornological vector spaces. So it follows easily the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1.43. *Let $\phi : E \to F$ be a bounded morphism of bornological vector spaces and $H \subset F$ a closed subspace then $\phi^{-1}(H)$ is closed.*

Proof. It's enough to consider the composition $\psi : E \to F \to \frac{F}{H}$ and to notice that $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\psi) = \phi^{-1}(H)$. □

Let's see some other useful properties of the set of nilpotent elements.

Proposition 2.1.44. *Let A be a bornological algebra and $A^{\circ\circ}$ the set of topologically nilponent elements of A. Then, $A^{\circ\circ}$ is closed and if A is semi-complete then $A^{\circ\circ}$ is semi-complete.*

Proof. Let a_n be a convergent sequence of topologically nilpotent elements and $a = \lim a_n$. Then the sequence

$$\{a^m\} = \{(\lim a_n)^m\} = \{\lim a_n^m\}$$

converges to 0 as $m \to \infty$ since all the terms a_n are topologically nilpotent, hence $a \in A^{\circ\circ}$. Finally a closed subset of a semi-complete space is semi-complete by definition. □

Proposition 2.1.45. *Let A be a semi-complete bornological algebra and $x = 1 - y$ with $y \in A^{\circ\circ}$, then x is a unit in A and*

$$x^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} y^n.$$

Proof. The series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} y^n$ is convergent, indeed $\forall m > 0$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} y^n + \cdots + y^{n+m} = \lim_{n\to\infty} y^n(1 + \cdots + y^m) = 0$$

because $y^n \to 0$ and the other factor is bounded. Since A is semi-complete then the series defines an element of A and by the usual argument of the Neumann series one sees that this series define an inverse of x. □

Lemma 2.1.46. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum whose system morphisms are injective, then*

$$A^\circ = \varinjlim A_i^\circ$$

as a set.

Proof. Since the image of a power-bounded element is power-bounded then $\varinjlim A_i^\circ \subset A^\circ$. Let now $a \in A^\circ$, this mean that $\{a, a^2, \cdots\}$ is bounded, hence can be written as a finite union of images of bounded subsets of A_i. So, there are some $A_{i_1}, ..., A_{i_n}$ such that

$$\{a, a^2, \cdots\} \subset \mathrm{Im}\,(B_{i_1}) \cup \cdots \cup \mathrm{Im}\,(B_{i_n})$$

for B_{i_j} bounded in A_{i_j}. Since the limit is filtered we can find an index k such that $i_1, ..., i_n \leqslant k$, and this mean that there exists $a' \in A_k$ such that $\alpha_k(a') = a$ and $B'_1, \cdots, B'_n \subset A_k$, bounded such that $B'_j = \mathrm{Im}\,(B_{i_j})$. Since the system morphisms are injective then

$$\{a, a^2, \cdots\} \subset B'_1 \cup \cdots \cup B'_n$$

so $a \in \varinjlim A_i^\circ$. □

Lemma 2.1.47. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum whose system morphisms are injective, let $X_i \subset A_i$ be a system of closed subsets then $\varinjlim X_i$ is a closed subset of A.*

Proof. Let $\{x_n\}$ be a bornologically convergent sequence in A with $x_n \in X_{i_n}$. By the definition of bornological convergence this mean that there exists a bounded subset $B \subset A$ such that for any $\lambda \in k^\times$

$$x - x_n \in \lambda B$$

for all $n > N$, for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. But to be bounded in A means that there exists an A_i such that $B \subset A_i$ and B is bounded in A_i, hence $x - x_n \in A_i$ for $n > N$. Moreover, the condition

$$x - x_n \in \lambda B$$

turns out to be equivalent to Mackey convergence in A_i, which is equivalent to the convergence for the seminorm on A_i.

Now, since x is an element of A there must exists an index k such that $x \in A_k$. Hence taking a $j \geqslant i, k$ we have that in A_j

$$x - x_n \in \lambda B$$

for all $n > N$ and since $x \in A_j$ and $x - x_n \in A_j$ then $x_n \in A_j$, and so $x_n \in X_j$. And since X_j is closed we have that $x \in X_j$. □

Proposition 2.1.48. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum whose system morphisms are injective, then A° is a closed submonoid of A. So, if A is semi-complete then also A° is semi-complete.*

Proof. Combining the previous two lemmas. □

2.2 Bornological strictly convergent power-series

Notation 2.2.1. From this section on, we will use the halos language and the conventions explained in the last section of previous chapter.

Let $(A, |\cdot|)$ be a seminormed algebra over k and consider the elements $f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j X^j \in A[\![X]\!]$ such that

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \sum_{n=i}^{m} |a_n| = 0, \forall m > 0$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the seminorm of A. Specializing this formula in the archimedean case, the request is that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_n| < \infty.$$

In the non-archimedean case we have to interpret the summation symbol as a tropical sum, obtaining

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |a_n| = 0.$$

We denote by $A\langle X\rangle \subset A[\![X]\!]$ the set of these elements which is called the *ring of strictly convergent power series* over A. $A\langle X\rangle$ is a seminormed ring whose seminorm is defined

$$\|f\| \doteq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |a_j| < \infty$$

for $f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j X^j \in A\langle X\rangle$.

This seminorm is well defined and equip $A\langle X\rangle$ with a structure of a seminormed subalgebra of $A[\![X]\!]$. In fact, for every $f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j X^j, \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k X^k \in A\langle X\rangle$ we have that

$$\|f \pm g\| \leqslant \|f\| + \|g\| = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |a_j| + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |b_k| < \infty$$

showing that $f \pm g \in A\langle X\rangle$. In a similar way

$$\|fg\| = \| \sum_{\substack{j+k=l \\ l=0}}^{\infty} a_j b_k\| \leqslant \sum_{\substack{j+k=l \\ l=0}}^{\infty} |a_j||b_k| = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |a_j|\right)\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |b_k|\right) < \infty$$

so $fg \in A\langle X\rangle$.

The next is the most important (for us) property of the ring of strictly convergent power series.

Proposition 2.2.2. *Let $(A, |\cdot|_A)$ and $(B, |\cdot|_B)$ be seminormed k-algebras with B complete. For every bounded ring homomorphism $\phi : A \to B$ and every $b \in B^\circ$ there exists a unique bounded homomorphism $\Phi : A\langle X\rangle \to B$ such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = b$,* i.e. *the map*

$$\mathrm{Hom}\,(A\langle X\rangle, B) \to \mathrm{Hom}\,(A, B) \times B^\circ$$

defined by $\Phi \mapsto (\Phi|_A, \Phi(X))$ is bijective.

Proof. Let $\{a_i\}$ be a sequence in A such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_i|_A < \infty$$

and $b \in B^\circ$, then the sequence

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \phi(a_i) b^i$$

must converge to an element in B because ϕ is bounded, b is power-bounded and B is complete. So the association

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i X^i \mapsto \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \phi(a_i) b^i$$

is a well defined map from $A\langle X\rangle \to B$ which we denote by Φ. By definition $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = b$. Let's show that is a bounded ring homomorphism. We have that

$$|\Phi(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i X^i)|_B = |\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \phi(a_i) b^i|_B \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |\phi(a_i)|_B |b^i|_B.$$

So choose a $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\phi(a)|_B \leqslant \sigma |a|_A$ for all $a \in A$ and $|b^i|_B \leqslant \sigma$ for all i then

$$|\Phi(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i X^i)|_B \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sigma |a_i|_A \sigma = \sigma^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_i|_A = \sigma^2 \| \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i X^i \|_A$$

hence Φ is bounded. The restriction of Φ to $A[X]$ is a ring homomorphism, so Φ is a ring homomorphism by extension by continuity.

If $\Psi : A\langle X\rangle \to B$ is another bounded ring homomorphism, with $\Psi|_A = \phi$ and $\Psi(X) = b$, then by continuity

$$\Psi(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i X^i) = \Psi(\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i X^i) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \Psi(\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i X^i) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \Phi(\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i X^i) = \Phi(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i X^i)$$

because Ψ and Φ have the same values on polynomials, hence $\Psi = \Phi$. □

Remark 2.2.3. We remark here that is not necessary to use the tropical addition in the non-archimedean case. The previous argument works the same but the algebra becomes equipped with a norm which doesn't satisfies the ultrametric triangle inequality, and moreover $k\langle X\rangle$ would not be the Tate algebra. It seems that the algebra that one get in this way is totally useless and pathological, but it satisfies the analogous universal property in the full category of seminormed algebras over k. But, in the category of algebras over k equipped with non-archimedean seminorm this universal object is the Tate algebra. This is a quite important point since we have to restrict in the same way the category of bornological algebras when considering the direct limits of seminormed algebras with non-archimedean seminorms to ensure the right universal properties involved in the construction of dagger algebras, and this in the following will be always done tacitly.

Remark 2.2.4. Another important fact is that in the non-archimedean case the "summation" norm that we defined in the case when $A = k$ is the Gauss norm which coincides with the spectral norm of $k\langle X\rangle$. If k is archimedean this is no more true and on $k\langle X\rangle$ the summation norm is not multiplicative nor power-multiplicative. Then, on $k\langle X\rangle$ one can consider the spectral seminorm, for which $k\langle X\rangle$ is not complete and the completion $\widetilde{k\langle X\rangle}$ satisfies the following universal property: given any seminormed ring A whose seminorm is power-multiplicative and $a \in A^\circ$, then there exists a unique map $\phi : \widetilde{k\langle X\rangle} \to A$ such that $\phi(X) = a$.

We will see in section 3.3 how our approach fixes this asymmetrical behaviour obtaining a dagger affinoid algebra theory which is works naturally in archimedean and in non-archimedean settings and whose overconvergent function algebra on the unit polydisk satisfies the "right" universal property.

Proposition 2.2.5. *Let A be a complete normed algebra, then $A\langle X\rangle$ is complete.*

Proof. Let

$$\{f_j\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_{i,j} X^i \right\}$$

be a Cauchy sequence in $A\langle X\rangle$. By the estimation

$$|a_{i,j+m} - a_{i,j}| \leqslant \|f_{j+m} - f_j\| \to 0$$

we get that the sequences of coefficients $\{a_{i,j}\}$ are Cauchy sequences for $j \to \infty$. Since A is complete they have a limit in A and we denote by it a_i. Consider the series

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i X^i$$

so

$$\|f\| = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_i| = \lim_{j\to\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_{i,j}| = \lim_{j\to\infty} \|f_j\|$$

and hence by the reverse tringle inequality and the fact that $\{f_j\}$ is a Cauchy sequence we have that

$$|\|f_{j+m}\| - \|f_j\|| \leqslant \|f_{j+m} - f_j\| \to 0$$

so $\lim_{j\to\infty} \|f_j\|$ is a Cauchy sequence which converge to $\|f\|$ which is therefore finite. So $f \in A\langle X\rangle$ and $f = \lim f_j$. □

Now, we want to generalize these facts about seminormed algebras to multiplicatively convex bornological algebras over k.

Definition 2.2.6. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a multiplicatively convex bornological algebra. We define the* ring of strictly convergent power-series *over A as the ring*

$$A\langle X\rangle \doteq \varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle$$

where the morphisms $A_i\langle X_i\rangle \to A_j\langle X_j\rangle$ are the natural extensions of $A_i \to A_j$ mapping $X_i \to X_j$.

More clearly, let $\varphi_{i,j} : A_i \to A_j$ be a map of the system defining $A = \varinjlim A_i$. This map can be composed with the canonical injection $A_j \hookrightarrow A_j\langle X_j\rangle$ obtaining a bounded map $A_i \to A_j\langle X_j\rangle$. By the universal property of $A_i\langle X_i\rangle$ shown above there exists a unique bounded map $A_i\langle X_i\rangle \to A_j\langle X_j\rangle$ extending $\varphi_{i,j}$ mapping X_i to X_j, and we use it to define our new system.

What follows is a simple lemma on filtered colimits, written for the sake of clarity because we will use this argument it several times in the subsequent proves.

Lemma 2.2.7. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum indexed by the directed set I and let $i_0 \in I$. Then*

$$\varinjlim_{i\geqslant i_0} A_i \cong \varinjlim A_i.$$

Proof. Clearly there is an injection

$$\varinjlim_{i\geqslant i_0} A_i \hookrightarrow \varinjlim A_i.$$

Let us show that this map is also surjective. Let $a \in \varinjlim A_i$ then there exists $a_j \in A_j$ for some $j \in I$, such that $\alpha_j(a_j) = a$, where $\alpha_j : A_j \to \varinjlim A_i$ is the canonical map. Since the limit is filtered we have that there exists a $k \in I$ such that $k \geqslant i_0$ and $k \geqslant j$. This mean that A_k is in the subsystem obtained by taking all $i \geqslant i_0$ and moreover

$$\alpha_j(a_j) = \alpha_k(\varphi_{j,k}(a_j)) = a$$

hence $a \in \varinjlim_{i\geqslant i_0} A_i$, as claimed. □

Theorem 2.2.8. *Let A be a multiplicatively convex bornological algebra. If A has well defined spectrum, then $A\langle X\rangle$ is a subalgebra of $A[\![X]\!]$ and*

$$A \subset A[X] \subset A\langle X\rangle.$$

Moreover $A\langle X\rangle$ has well defined spectrum, and if A is complete then also $A\langle X\rangle$ is complete.

Proof. $A\langle X\rangle$ is by definition the colimit of a system of seminormed algebras in the category of bornological algebras, hence is multiplicatively convex (and complete if A is complete). A has well defined spectrum means that

$$A = \mathcal{U}(\varinjlim A_i) \cong \varinjlim \mathcal{U}(A_i)$$

is a filtered colimit of rings and hence also

$$A\langle X\rangle = \varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle$$

is a filtered colimit, since the associated diagram of the system is always I-shaped. Hence also $A\langle X\rangle$ has well defined spectrum and is complete if the A_i are complete.

By definition for each i we have

$$A_i\langle X_i\rangle \subset A_i[\![X_i]\!]$$

so we have that

$$A\langle X\rangle = \varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle \subset \varinjlim A_i[\![X_i]\!]$$

where the system morphisms of $\varinjlim A_i[\![X_i]\!]$ are canonically defined as above for $\varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle$ (and also in this case are uniquely determined). So, we are reduced to show the isomorphism

$$\varinjlim A_i[\![X_i]\!] \cong (\varinjlim A_i)[\![X]\!] = A[\![X]\!].$$

To show this isomorphism we check that $\varinjlim A_i[\![X_i]\!]$ has the same universal property of $A[\![X]\!]$ in the category of rings. Indeed, the universal property of $A[\![X]\!]$ is the following: given any commutative A-algebra $A \to S$ and any ideal $I \subset S$ such that S is complete in the I-adic topology and an element $x \in I$ there exists a unique morphism $\Phi : A[\![X]\!] \to S$ such that

1. Φ is and A-algebra morphism;
2. Φ is continuous for the (X)-adic and I-adic topologies;
3. $\Phi(X) = x$.

Now, to give an A-algebra structure on S is equivalent to give a system of A_i-algebra structures such that if $\varphi_{i,j} : A_i \to A_j$ is a morphism of the inductive system which define $\varinjlim A_i$, then we have the commutative diagram



by the universal property of $A = \varinjlim A_i$. So, by the universal property of the rings $A_i[\![X_i]\!]$ we have a unique system of morphisms $\Phi_i : A_i[\![X_i]\!] \to S$, with the three properties listed so far. This system of morphisms gives a map

$$\Phi = \varinjlim \Phi_i : \varinjlim A_i[\![X_i]\!] \to S$$

which is well defined (by compatibility of the Φ_i with the system morphisms) and that is an A-algebra morphism. Then, take $X_i \in A_i[\![X_i]\!]$ and denote its image in $\varinjlim A_i[\![X_i]\!]$ by the

canonical morphisms $\alpha_i : A_i[\![X_i]\!] \to \varinjlim A_i[\![X_i]\!]$ with X. This element is indipendent of i because if we take another $X_k \in A_k[\![X_k]\!]$ then there exists a $X_l \in A_l[\![X_l]\!]$ such that $i \leqslant l$ and $k \leqslant l$ and so

$$\alpha_i = \alpha_l \circ \varphi_{i,l}, \alpha_k = \alpha_l \circ \varphi_{k,l}$$

and so

$$X = \alpha_i(X_i) = \alpha_l \circ \varphi_{i,l}(X_i) = \alpha_l(X_l)$$

and

$$\alpha_k(X_k) = \alpha_l \circ \varphi_{i,k}(X_k) = \alpha_l(X_l) = \alpha_i(X_i) = X.$$

Then, we see that if $x = \Phi_i(X_i)$ for any i, for the universal property of $A_i[\![X_i]\!]$, we have

$$x = \Phi_i(X_i) = \varinjlim \Phi_i(\alpha_i(X_i)) = \Phi(X).$$

To show that Φ is continuous it is enough to show that for each $n > 0$ there exist $m = m(n) > 0$ such that

$$(X^m) \subset \Phi^{-1}(I^n).$$

This follow the fact that for each i we have

$$(X_i^{m_i}) \subset \Phi_i^{-1}(I^n)$$

so by the fact that $\varphi_{i_0,i}(X_{i_0}) = X_i$, for $i \geqslant i_0$ it follow that

$$(X_i^{m_{i_0}}) \subset \Phi_i^{-1}(I^n)$$

for any $i \geqslant i_0$ for a fixed i_0, because

$$\Phi_i^{-1}(I^n) \supset \varphi_{i_0,i}(\Phi_{i_0}^{-1}(I^n)) \supset \varphi_{i_0,i}((X_{i_0}^{m_{i_0}}))$$

and since $\Phi_i^{-1}(I^n)$ is an ideal then $\Phi_i^{-1}(I^n) \supset (X_i^{m_{i_0}})$. But by the lemma 2.2.7 we have that

$$\varinjlim_{i \geqslant i_0} A_i[\![X_i]\!] \cong \varinjlim A_i[\![X_i]\!]$$

hence Φ is continuous. Finally, the uniqueness of the morphism is ensured by the universal property of the direct limit.

To show that $A[X] \subset A\langle X\rangle$ we need to show an isomorphism analog to the previous one, *i.e.* the following

$$\varinjlim A_i[X_i] \cong (\varinjlim A_i)[X] = A[X]$$

defining an inductive system for $\varinjlim A_i[X_i]$ always mapping $X_i \to X_j$. So let's consider the universal property of $A[X]$, which is the following: given any ring B and a ring homomorphism $\phi : A \to B$ and any $b \in B$ there exists a unique morphism $\Phi : A[X] \to A$ such that $\Phi(X) = b$ and $\Phi|_A = \phi$. Now, to give a morphism $A \to B$ is the same to give a compatible system of morphism $A_i \to B$ which gives a system of morphism $\Phi_i : A_i[X_i] \to B$. This morphisms are compatible, hence we get a morphism $\Phi = \varinjlim \Phi_i : \varinjlim A_i[X_i] \to B$ whose restriction to A is equal to ϕ by definition and $\Phi(X) = b$ since $\Phi_i(X_i) = b$ for any i. As before the universal property of the direct limit ensure that this morphism is unique, and this proves that $A[X]$ and $\varinjlim A_i[X_i]$ have the same universal property. □

Theorem 2.2.9. *If A is a complete bornological algebra with well defined spectrum, then $A[X]$ is (bornologically) dense in $A\langle X\rangle$.*

Proof. We have, using the same notation of previous theorem, the isomorphism

$$\varinjlim A_i[X_i] \cong A[X]$$

and we have for each i

$$\overline{A_i[X_i]} = A_i\langle X_i\rangle$$

and hence the injection

$$\varinjlim A_i[X_i] \hookrightarrow \varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle$$

extends to an isomorphism of bornological vector spaces

$$\varinjlim \overline{A_i[X_i]} \cong \varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle = A\langle X\rangle.$$

We saw that a subspace of a bornological vector space A is closed if and only if it is the kernel of a morphism

$$\phi : A \to B$$

where B is a separated bornological vector space, *i.e.* $\overline{\{0\}} = \{0\}$ in B. In our case we have that $A\langle X\rangle$ is a complete bornological algebra with well defined spectrum, which is to say that it is a filtered limit of k-Banach algebras where the morphisms $\varphi_{i,j}$ are monomorphisms. Hence to give a morphism from $A\langle X\rangle$ to a separated bornological vector space is the same to give a system of morphisms $\phi_i : A_i\langle X_i\rangle \to B$, such that $\phi_j \circ \varphi_{i,j} = \phi_i$. Hence all kernels $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\phi_i)$ must be closed subspaces of $A_i\langle X_i\rangle$ and so

$$\mathrm{Ker}\,(\phi) = \varinjlim \mathrm{Ker}\,(\phi_i),$$

by the commutation of limits with filtered colimits.

Now suppose that

$$\overline{\varinjlim A_i[X_i]} \subset A\langle X\rangle$$

in a strict way, then there should exist a linear map of bornological vector spaces

$$f : A\langle X\rangle \to B$$

with B separable and $\mathrm{Ker}\, f \supset \overline{\varinjlim A_i[X_i]}$ and this gives a system of maps

$$f_i = f \circ \alpha_i : A_i\langle X_i\rangle \to B$$

whose kernel is a closed subset that contains $\overline{A_i[X_i]}$, hence $\mathrm{Ker}\,(f_i) = A_i\langle X_i\rangle$, *i.e.* f_i is the null map. This implies that also f is the null map and finally that the closure of $\varinjlim A_i[X_i]$ is $A\langle X\rangle$. □

Definition 2.2.10. *Let A be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum, by induction for each $n > 0$ we define*

$$A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle \doteq A\langle X_1, ..., X_{n-1}\rangle\langle X_n\rangle.$$

Notice that by previous propositions $A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle$ has well defined spectrum and if A is complete then also $A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle$ is complete. Furthermore it doesn't matter the order of the variables, for example

$$A\langle X, Y\rangle \cong A\langle Y, X\rangle$$

i.e.

$$A\langle X\rangle\langle Y\rangle \cong A\langle Y\rangle\langle X\rangle.$$

We can see it using the isomorphisms

$$A_i\langle X_i\rangle\langle Y_i\rangle \cong A_i\langle Y_i\rangle\langle X_i\rangle$$

which give a well defined map

$$\varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle\langle Y_i\rangle \cong \varinjlim A_i\langle Y_i\rangle\langle X_i\rangle$$

which gives the isomorpshim

$$A\langle X, Y\rangle \cong A\langle Y, X\rangle$$

since it is an isomorphism of systems.

Proposition 2.2.11. *Let A be a complete bornological algebra, then*

$$(A\langle X\rangle)^\circ = \varinjlim (A_i\langle X_i\rangle)^\circ$$

as sets.

Proof. We are in the hypothesis of lemma 2.1.46. □

For the next theorem we need a couple of lemmas.

Lemma 2.2.12. *Let A be a k-seminormed algebra with $A = \varinjlim A_i$ with A_i seminormed subalgebras of A_i (*i.e. *the morphism of the system are strict inclusions), then*

$$\varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle \cong A\langle X\rangle$$

i.e. *the two definitions of $A\langle X\rangle$ as a seminormed or as a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum coincide.*

Proof. We know the universal property of $A\langle X\rangle$, we need to check that $\varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle$ satisfies the same one. So let $\phi : A \to B$ be a bounded morphism of k-seminormed algebras, with B complete, we obtain $\phi_i = \phi \circ \alpha_i : A_i \to B$, by composing with the canonical morphisms induced by the inclusions. We get canonical morphisms $\Phi_i : A_i\langle X_i\rangle \to B$ which extend the ϕ_is by which we obtain a unique morphism $\Phi : A\langle X\rangle \to B$ with the required properties, proving the lemma. □

Lemma 2.2.13. *Let A be a seminormed algebra and B a complete bornological algebra with well defined spectrum. For every bounded morphism of rings $\phi : A \to B$ and any power-bounded element $b \in B^\circ$ there exists a unique bounded morphism of rings $\Phi : A\langle X\rangle \to B$ such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = b$. In other words, the map* $\mathrm{Hom}\,(A\langle X\rangle, B) \to \mathrm{Hom}\,(A, B) \times B^\circ$ *defined by $\Phi \mapsto (\Phi|_A, \Phi(X))$ is bijective.*

Proof. Let's write $B = \varinjlim B_i$. Under this hypothesis we have that

$$\mathrm{Im}\,(\phi) = \varinjlim (B_i \cap \phi(A))$$

with the bornology induced by the inclusion $\mathrm{Im}\,(\phi) \hookrightarrow B$. Each $B_i \cap \phi(A)$ is a normed subalgebra of B_i and we have, by definition, the commutative diagram



.

We notice also that we have a system of bounded homomorphisms of seminormed algebras from the preimage

$$\pi_i : \phi^{-1}(B_i \cap \phi(A)) \to B_i \cap \phi(A).$$

Moreover, $B_i \cap \phi(A)$ is a subalgebra of $\phi(A)$, hence $\phi^{-1}(B_i \cap \phi(A))$ is a subalgebra of A. Now suppose that the element $b \in B^\circ$, chosen in the hypothesis, is such that $b \in B_{i_0}^\circ$. This implies that $b \in B_i^\circ$ for any $i > i_0$ and this part of the system is final by lemma 2.2.7, hence we can suppose $b \in B_i^\circ$ for each i. So we can always find a unique system of maps of k-seminormed algebras

$$\Pi_i : \phi^{-1}(B_i \cap \phi(A))\langle X_i\rangle \to B_i$$

with $\Pi_i|_{B_i \cap \phi(A)} = \pi_i$ and $\pi_i(X_i) = b$. Then we can apply the functor $\varinjlim$, because we have the system with the same diagram, and obtain a well defined mapped

$$\Phi : \varinjlim \phi^{-1}(B_i \cap \phi(A))\langle X_i\rangle \to \varinjlim B_i$$

and, by the previous lemma

$$\varinjlim \phi^{-1}(B_i \cap \phi(A))\langle X_i\rangle \cong (\varinjlim \phi^{-1}(B_i \cap \phi(A)))\langle X\rangle = A\langle X\rangle.$$

Therefore we have obtained a well defined map

$$\Phi : A\langle X\rangle \to \varinjlim B_i$$

which is unique by construction, since all the maps of the system are uniquely determined. Moreover $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = b$ are clear by the definition of Φ. □

Theorem 2.2.14. *Let A and B be bornological algebras with well defined spectrum and B complete. For every bounded morphism of algebras $\phi : A \to B$ and any power-bounded element $b \in B^\circ$ there exists a unique bounded morphism of algebras $\Phi : A\langle X\rangle \to B$ such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = b$. In other words, the map*

$$\mathrm{Hom}\,(A\langle X\rangle, B) \to \mathrm{Hom}\,(A, B) \times B^\circ$$

defined by $\Phi \mapsto (\Phi|_A, \Phi(X))$ is bijective.

Proof. We can write $A = \varinjlim A_i$ and $B = \varinjlim B_j$ where B_j are k-Banach algebras. To give a morphism $\phi : A \to B$ is tantamount to give a system of morphisms $\phi_i : A_i \to B$, so by the previous lemma we get a system of maps $\Phi_i : A_i\langle X_i\rangle \to B$ of which we can take the limit map

$$\Phi : \varinjlim \Phi_i : \varinjlim A_i\langle X_i\rangle \cong A\langle X\rangle \to B.$$

The property $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = b$ are inherited from the maps Φ_i □

In next sections we will be mainly interested to the following generalization:

Corollary 2.2.15. *Let A and B be bornological algebras with well defined spectrum with B complete. For every bounded morphism of rings $\phi : A \to B$ and any finite set of power-bounded elements $b_1, ..., b_n \in B^\circ$ there exists a unique bounded morphism of rings $\Phi : A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle \to B$ such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X_i) = b_i$.*

Proof. □

2.3 The ring of bornological overconvergent power-series

In order to define the ring of overconvergent power-series we describe the following generalization of the construction of the previous section. Given any seminormed k-algebra A and a $\rho > 0$, we can define the ring

$$A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle \doteq \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i X^i \in A[\![X]\!] | \lim_{i\to\infty} \sum_{n=i}^{m} |a_n|\rho^i = 0, \forall m > 0 \right\}.$$

This algebra satisfies the following universal property:

Proposition 2.3.1. *Given any complete normed algebra B, any $\rho \in \sqrt{k^\times}$, a morphism $\phi : A \to B$ and an $f \in B$ such that $\lambda^{-1}f \in (B \otimes_k K)^\circ$ (where K/k is any valued extension of k with $|\lambda| \in |K|$), for $\lambda \in K, |\lambda| = \rho$, then there exists a unique morphism*

$$\Phi : A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle \to B$$

such that $\Phi(X) = f$ and $\Phi|_A = \phi$.

Proof. □

We can generalize this to any bornological algebra with well defined spectrum, simply defining, for $A = \varinjlim A_i$

$$A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle \doteq \varinjlim A_i\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$$

with obvious system morphisms. In the same vein we can define

$$A\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle$$

for $\rho_i \in \sqrt{k^\times}$.

Theorem 2.3.2. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum, then*

1. *$A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$ has well defined spectrum;*
2. *$A[X] \subset A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle \subset A[\![X]\!]$;*
3. *$A[X]$ is bornologically dense in $A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$;*
4. *if A is complete then also $A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$ is complete.*

Proof. The proves are very similar to the ones given in the previous section. □

Let's introduce the main object of this section.

Definition 2.3.3. *Given a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum $A = \varinjlim A_i$ we define the* ring of overconvergent power-series *as the ring*

$$A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \doteq \varinjlim_{\rho>1} A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$$

where the morphisms $A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle \mapsto A\langle (\rho')^{-1}X\rangle$ are given by the canonical immersion of $A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$ in $A\langle (\rho')^{-1}X\rangle$ if $\rho > \rho'$.

On $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ we consider the direct limit bornology.

Proposition 2.3.4. *Let A be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum, then $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ is a bornological subalgebra of $A[\![X]\!]$ and*

$$A[X] \subset A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \subset A\langle X\rangle.$$

Moreover, also $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ has well defined spectrum.

Proof. $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ is by definition bornological algebra and clearly has well defined spectrum. The inclusion $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \subset A\langle X\rangle$ is given by the inclusion $A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle \subset A\langle X\rangle$ for any $\rho > 1$ and also $A[X] \subset A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ is given by $A[X] \subset A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$. □

Proposition 2.3.5. *If A is a complete bornological algebra, then also $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ is complete.*

Proof. Let $A = \varinjlim_{i\in I} A_i$ with A_i k-Banach algebras. Then, by definition

$$A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle = \varinjlim_{i\in I} A_i\langle \rho^{-1}X_i\rangle$$

where also $A_i\langle \rho^{-1}X_i\rangle$ are k-Banach algebras. So,

$$A\langle X\rangle^\dagger = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \varinjlim A_i\langle \rho^{-1}X_i\rangle \cong \varinjlim_{\substack{\rho>1\\ i\in I}} A_i\langle \rho^{-1}X_i\rangle$$

where the last colimit is the composition of the two colimits. Is a general result of category theory that this two systems have the same colimit, and the system is clearly filtered. So, $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ is a filtered colimit of k-Banach algebras with injective system maps, hence is bornologically complete. □

Proposition 2.3.6. *If A is a complete bornological algebra, then $A[X]$ is dense in $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$.*

Proof. For any ρ we have that $A[X]$ is dense in $A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$, hence the same reasoning did in the case of $A\langle X\rangle$ (theorem 2.2.9) applies to show that $A[X]$ is bornologically dense in $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$. We omit the details. □

Definition 2.3.7. *Let A be a complete bornological algebra, by induction for each $n > 0$ we define*

$$A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger \doteq A\langle X_1, ..., X_{n-1}\rangle^\dagger\langle X_n\rangle^\dagger.$$

Notice that by previous propositions $A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger$ is a complete bornological algebra. It doesn't matter the order of the variables, for example

$$A\langle X, Y\rangle^\dagger \cong A\langle Y, X\rangle^\dagger$$

i.e. that

$$A\langle X\rangle^\dagger\langle Y\rangle^\dagger \cong A\langle Y\rangle^\dagger\langle X\rangle^\dagger.$$

We can see it using the isomorphisms

$$A_i\langle \rho^{-1}X_i\rangle\langle \rho^{-1}Y_i\rangle \cong A_i\langle \rho^{-1}Y_i\rangle\langle \rho^{-1}X_i\rangle$$

which give a well defined map

$$\varinjlim_{\substack{\rho>1\\ i\in I}} A\langle \rho^{-1}X_i\rangle\langle \rho^{-1}Y_i\rangle \cong \varinjlim_{\substack{\rho>1\\ i\in I}} A\langle \rho^{-1}Y_i\rangle\langle \rho^{-1}X_i\rangle$$

which gives the isomorphism

$$A\langle X, Y\rangle^\dagger \cong A\langle Y, X\rangle^\dagger$$

since it is an isomorphism of systems.

The following notion will be of crucial importance for us. It will be our replacement of the notion of power-boundedness when we are working with bornological algebras. So, in the next chapter all the universal properties which will characterize our affinoid dagger algebras will be stated in term of the concept of weak-power-boundedness, which we now explain.

Definition 2.3.8. *Let A be a bornological algebra over k and $\overline{k}$ an algebraic closure of k. We say that $f \in A$* satisfies the weak power-boundedness condition *if for any $\lambda \in \overline{k}$ with $|\lambda| > 1$ $\lambda^{-1}f \in (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\circ$. We also say that f is* weakly power-bounded. *We denote the set of weakly power-bounded elements of A with $A^\diamond$.*

Remark 2.3.9. We need use $\overline{k}$ to deal with the case when $k^\times$ is a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}_+$.

Theorem 2.3.10. *Let A and B be bornological algebras with well defined spectrum and let B be complete. For every bounded morphism of rings $\phi : A \to B$ and any element $b \in B^\diamond$, there exists a unique bounded morphism of rings $\Phi : A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \to B$ such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = b$. In other words, the map*

$$\mathrm{Hom}\,(A\langle X\rangle^\dagger, B) \to \mathrm{Hom}\,(A, B) \times B^\diamond$$

defined by $\Phi \mapsto (\Phi|_A, \Phi(X))$ is bijective.

Proof. Inherited by the universal properties of $A\langle\rho^{-1}X\rangle$. □

Corollary 2.3.11. *Let A and B be bornological algebras with well defined spectrum and let B be complete. For every bounded morphism of rings $\phi : A \to B$ and any finite set of elements $b_1, ..., b_n \in B^\diamond$, there exists a unique bounded morphism of rings $\Phi : A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger \to B$ such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X_i) = b_i$.*

Proof. □

Remark 2.3.12. We notice that $X \notin (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \otimes_k \overline{k})^\circ$ but $\lambda^{-1}X \in (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \otimes_k \overline{k})^\circ$ for any $\lambda \in \overline{k}$ with $|\lambda| > 1$.

In general $A^\circ \subset A^\diamond$ in a strict way, and we have the following characterization.

Proposition 2.3.13. *Let A be a bornological algebra, then*

$$A^\diamond = \bigcap_{\lambda \in k, |\lambda|>1} \lambda(A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\circ \cap A = (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond \cap A.$$

Proof. By definition $f \in A^\diamond$ if and only if $\lambda^{-1}f \in (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\circ$ for all $\lambda \in \overline{k}, |\lambda| > 1$, hence $f \in \lambda(A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\circ \cap A$ for all $\lambda \in \overline{k}, |\lambda| > 1$. □

Proposition 2.3.14. *Let A be a bornological algebra, then $A^\diamond$ is a multiplicative submonoid of A containing* 0.

Proof. Let $f, g \in A^\diamond$, then

$$fg \in (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond \cap A$$

but $(A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond = (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond$ since $|\overline{k}^\times|$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}_+$. □

Proposition 2.3.15. *Let $\phi : A \to B$ be a morphism of bornological algebras, then $\phi(A^\diamond) \subset B^\diamond$.*

Proof. We know that $\phi(A^\circ) \subset B^\circ$, so $\lambda\phi(A^\circ) \subset \lambda B^\circ$, hence the proposition. □

Corollary 2.3.16. *The association $A \mapsto A^\diamond$ is a functor from the category of bornological algebras to the category of multiplicative monoids.*

Proof. □

Proposition 2.3.17. *Let A be a seminormed algebra, then $A^\circ = A^\diamond$.*

Proof. Suppose $k = \overline{k}$. We have to show that in a k-seminormed algebra

$$\bigcap_{\lambda \in k, |\lambda|>1} \lambda A^\circ = A^\circ.$$

We know that the inclusion $\bigcap_{\lambda\in k,|\lambda|>1} \lambda A^\circ \supset A^\circ$ is always true, so let's take $f \in \bigcap_{\lambda\in k,|\lambda|>1} \lambda A^\circ$. This mean that $|f|_{\sup} \leqslant |\lambda|$ for any $|\lambda| > 1$ hence $|f|_{\sup} \leqslant 1 \Rightarrow f \in A^\circ$.

If $k \neq \overline{k}$ then

$$A^\diamond = (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond \cap A = \{f \in A || f|_{\sup} \leqslant 1\} = A^\circ.$$

□

Proposition 2.3.18. *Let A be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum and whose system morphisms are injective then $A^\diamond$ is closed in A.*

Proof. By proposition 2.1.48 we know that A° is closed. Hence λA° is closed because $f \mapsto \lambda f$ is an isomorphism of bornological sets. So by definition $(A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond$ is closed and from the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} k & \longrightarrow & A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \overline{k} & \longrightarrow & A \otimes_k \overline{k} \end{array}$$

where $k \to \overline{k}$ is a strict monomorphism we deduce that $A \to (A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond$ is a strict monomorphism (proposition 1.2.10), hence $(A \otimes_k \overline{k})^\diamond \cap A$ is closed in A. □

Lemma 2.3.19. *Let $\phi : A \to B$ be a morphism of bornological algebras with well defined spectrum such that the set of elements of the form $\frac{\phi(f)}{\phi(g)}$ with $f, g \in A$ and $\phi(g)$ invertible is dense in B, then $\phi^* : \mathcal{M}(B) \to \mathcal{M}(A))$ is injective.*

Proof. The same argument used in the case when A and B are normed algebras applies. □

Proposition 2.3.20. *Let $A\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$ be the ring of overconvergent power series over a complete bornological algebra $A \cong \lim A_i$ with well defined spectrum, then*

$$\mathcal{M}(A\langle X_1, \ldots, X_n\rangle^\dagger) = \bigcap_{\rho_1,\ldots,\rho_n>1} \mathcal{M}(A\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, \ldots, \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle).$$

Proof. Since the maps of the system $A\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, \ldots, \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle \to A\langle (\rho_1')^{-1}X_1, \ldots, (\rho_n')^{-1}X_n\rangle$ are bounded monomorphisms with bornologically dense image. Applying the previous lemma we get that the induced map of spectra

$$\mathcal{M}(A\langle (\rho_1')^{-1}X_1, \ldots, (\rho_n')^{-1}X_n)\rangle \to \mathcal{M}(A\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, \ldots, \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle)$$

is injective. Then, the projective system is in fact an intersection of topological spaces. □

The following theorem will give the geometrical interpretation of the weak-powerbounded elements.

Theorem 2.3.21. *Let $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ be the ring of overconvergent power series over a seminormed k-algebra, then*

1. *$f \in (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\circ \iff |f(x)| \leqslant 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle)$ for a suitable $\rho > 1$;*
2. *f is topologically nilpotent if and only if $|f(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)$;*
3. *$f \in (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\diamond \iff |f(x)| \leqslant 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)$.*

Proof. 1. We saw that $(A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\circ = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} A^\circ\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$, because $A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$ are seminormed algebras and $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ is equipped with the direct limit bornology. Hence $f \in (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\circ$ is equivalent to $f \in A^\circ\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$ for some $\rho > 1$ which is equivalent to $|f(x)| \leqslant 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle)$.

2. Clear since in this way f is topologically nilpotent in $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ if and only if is topologically nilpotent in $A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$ for some $\rho > 1$.

3. Suppose $f \in (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\diamond$, this mean that $f \in (A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle)^\circ$ for all $\rho > 1$, and so $|f(x)| \leqslant 1$ for any $x \in \mathcal{M}(A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle)$. This is true for any $\rho > 1$ hence $|f(x)| \leqslant 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)$.

□

Example 2.3.22. The canonical example of an element which is weakly-power-bounded but not power-bounded is $X \in A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$: $X \in (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\diamond$ because for any $\rho \in k = \overline{k}$ with $|\rho| > 1$ we have that $\rho^{-1}X \in (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\circ$. But $X \notin (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\circ$ because $X \notin A\langle \rho^{-1}X\rangle$ for all $\rho > 1$.

Remark 2.3.23. The condition $f \in (A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\diamond$ is equivalent to $|f|_{\sup} \leqslant 1$, where the sup is calculated on the point of the spectrum. The difference between thinking f as a weakly power-bounded element of $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$, endowed with the direct limit bornology or as power-bounded element of $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ endowed with spectral norm is that in the latter case there is no clear universal property that characterized $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ in the category of seminormed algebras. Instead working in our bornological settings we have a pretty good universal property to work with and a weaker notion of completeness to exploit.

The next proposition shows the strict link between the direct limit bornology of $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ and the spectral norm.

Proposition 2.3.24. *Let A be a normed k-algebra, then*

$$\mathcal{M}(A\langle X\rangle^\dagger) \cong \mathcal{M}((A\langle X\rangle^\dagger, |\cdot|_{\sup})) \cong \mathcal{M}(A\langle X\rangle).$$

Proof. The second isomorphism is classical, and $\mathcal{M}(A\langle X\rangle^\dagger) \cong \mathcal{M}(A\langle X\rangle)$ come from proposition 2.3.20. □

Analogous statement of the previous proposition and theorem can be given for $A\langle X_1, \dots, X_n\rangle^\dagger$. We omit a detailed study of this case. We conclude this section noticing that we can also define the algebras $A\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, \dots, \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle^\dagger$ whose explicit description is left to the reader.

2.4 Weak power-bounded elements and algebraic monads

Let $\phi : A \to B$ be a morphism bornological algebras with well defined spectrum. We know that ϕ induces two maps of monoids

$$\phi^\diamond : A^\diamond \to B^\diamond,$$

$$\phi^\circ : A^\circ \to B^\circ.$$

We study the first one that seems to be the more interesting, from a geometrical point of view. In the aim of finding a geometrical meaning to the functor $^\diamond$ we associate to A not simply the monoid $^\diamond$ but the algebraic monad defined

$$\Sigma_{A^\diamond}(X) \doteq \left\{ \sum_{x\in X} m_x x | (m_x) \in \mathcal{R}(A^\diamond) \right\}$$

for any set X (see appendix B for notations). We notice that $|\Sigma_{A^\diamond}| = \Sigma_{A^\diamond}(1) \cong A^\diamond$ and that $\Sigma_{A^\diamond}$ is an object which carry more information that only $A^\diamond$, in fact its structure depends also on the embedding $A \hookrightarrow A^\diamond$ and on the additive structure of A. char 22

Remember that for a seminormed ring $A^\diamond = A^\circ$. We will need the following characterization of power-bounded elements.

Lemma 2.4.1. *Let A be a seminormed $\mathbb{C}$-algebra then*

$$(f_i) \in \Sigma_{A^\diamond}(\mathbf{n}) \iff \sup_{x\in\mathcal{M}(A)} \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)| \leqslant 1$$

Proof. First let's check that $\sup_{x\in\mathcal{M}(A)} \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)| \leqslant 1 \Rightarrow (f_i) \in \Sigma_{A^\diamond}(\mathbf{n})$. Given any $g_1, ..., g_n \in A^\circ$, then $|g_i|_{\sup} \leqslant 1$, hence

$$\sup_{x\in\mathcal{M}(A)} |\sum_{i=1}^n (f_i g_i)(x)| \leqslant \sup_{x\in\mathcal{M}(A)} \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)||g_i(x)| \leqslant \sup_{x\in\mathcal{M}(A)} \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)| \leqslant 1$$

so $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i g_i \in A^\circ$.

Let's suppose now that $(f_i) \in \Sigma_{A^\diamond}(\mathbf{n})$. Let's take

$$z_i = \frac{|f_i(x)|}{f_i(x)} \in k^\circ \hookrightarrow A^\circ$$

for a fixed $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. Since $(f_i) \in \Sigma_{A^\diamond}(\mathbf{n})$,

$$|\sum_{i=1}^n (f_i z_i)(x)| \leqslant 1$$

so

$$|\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x) \frac{|f_i(x)|}{f_i(x)}| = |\sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)|| = \sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)| \leqslant 1.$$

So by varying $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ we can always choose z_i as above, and so we can write

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |f_i(x)| \leqslant 1, \forall x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$$

which is the required fact. □

Remark 2.4.2. We notice that if k is non-archimedean, the statement of the previous lemma holds trivially. Moreover, if $k = \mathbb{R}$ we can tensor A with $\mathbb{C}$, applying the lemma and then pullback the result on A because $A^\circ = (A \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C})^\circ \cap A$.

Proposition 2.4.3. *The association $A \mapsto \Sigma_{A^\diamond}$ is a functor from the category of k-normed algebras to the category of algebraic monads.*

Proof. We have to check that a bounded k-algebra homomorphism $\phi : A \to B$ induces a morphism of algebraic monads $\phi^\diamond : \Sigma_{A^\diamond} \to \Sigma_{B^\diamond}$. Since ϕ is bounded then for any $f \in A$ we have that $|\phi(f)(x)| = |f(\phi^*(x))|$ for any $x \in \mathcal{M}(B)$. So, if for $f_1, ..., f_n \in A$ we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_i(x)| \leqslant 1, \forall x \in \mathcal{M}(A) \iff (f_i) \in \Sigma_{A^\diamond}(\mathbf{n})$$

by lemma 2.4.1, hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\phi(f_i)(x)| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_i(\phi^*(x))| \leqslant 1, \forall x \in \mathcal{M}(B)$$

which (always for lemma 2.4.1) implies $(\phi(f_i)) \in \Sigma_{B^\diamond}(\mathbf{n})$. That the obtained map $\phi^\diamond$ is a monad morphism is a direct consequence of the fact that ϕ is a morphism or rings and $\Sigma_{A^\diamond}$, $\Sigma_{B^\diamond}$ are submonads of Σ_A and Σ_B respectively.

□

Remark 2.4.4. If k is non-archimedean the previous proposition is almost trivial and well known.

Definition 2.4.5. *Let A be a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum, we say that A is* regular *if*

$$A^\diamond = \{f \in A || f|_{\sup} \leqslant 1\}.$$

i.e. a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum is regular if the concept of spectrally power-boundedness coincides with the concept of weakly power-boundedness.

Theorem 2.4.6. *The association $A \mapsto \Sigma_{A^\diamond}$ is a functor from the category of k-regular bornological algebras to the category of algebraic monads.*

Proof. Let's write $A = \varinjlim A_i$, $B = \varinjlim B_j$ with A_i, B_j seminormed algebras and $\phi : A \to B$ a bounded map. To show that ϕ induces a map of algebraic monads $\phi^\diamond : \Sigma_{A^\diamond} \to \Sigma_{B^\diamond}$ it's enough to show that ϕ is bounded with respect to the spectral seminorm of A and B. But this is shown in theorem 2.1.36 □

Remark 2.4.7. We showed that the ring of overconvergent power-series $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$, is regular if A is a k-normed algebra because we characterized the elements of $(A\langle X\rangle^\dagger)^\diamond$ as the power-bounded elements with respect to the spectral norm. Hence we can restate this observation by saying that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{RBorn}(\mathbf{Alg}_k) & \xrightarrow{\diamond} & \mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{Sets}) \\ \downarrow & \nearrow_{\circ} & \\ \mathbf{Sn}(\mathbf{Alg}_k) & & \end{array}$$

commutes, where $\mathbf{RBorn}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ denotes the category of regular bornological algebras over k, $\mathbf{Sn}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ the category of seminormed algebras over k and the functor $\mathbf{RBorn}(\mathbf{Alg}_k) \to \mathbf{Sn}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ is the functor which associate to any regular bornological algebra A the seminormed algebra $(A, |\cdot|_{\sup})$, where $|\cdot|_{\sup}$ is the spectral seminorm of A.

We notice also that we could have stated the last theorem for any complete bornological algebra, without requiring regularity, and studying the association $A \mapsto \Sigma_{A^s}$, but we are not interested in the study of the non regular case.

Proposition 2.4.8. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_i$ be a regular bornological algebra such that all $\varphi_{i,j} : A_i \to A_j$ have dense image, then $A^{\circ\circ}$ is a Σ_{A°-module of A.*

Proof. We have to show that for any $f_1, \dots, f_n \in A^{\circ\circ}$ and any $g_1, \dots, g_n \in \Sigma_{A^\circ}(\mathbf{n})$ we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i g_i \in A^{\circ\circ}.$$

Then $f \in A^{\circ\circ} \iff f \in A_i^{\circ\circ}$ for some i, which is equivalent to say that $|f(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(A_i)$, and since $\mathcal{M}(A) \subset \mathcal{M}(A_i)$, this implies that $|f(x)| < 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. Moreover, since the maps $\varphi_{i,j}^* : \mathcal{M}(A_j) \to \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ are injective, then

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \bigcap \mathcal{M}(A_i)$$

hence $f \in A^{\circ\circ} \iff |f|_{\sup} < 1$. So, for every $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ we have that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |g_i(x)| \leqslant 1$ hence

$$|\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x) g_i(x)| \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_i(x)||g_i(x)| < \sum_{i=1}^{n} |g_i(x)| \leqslant 1, \forall x \in \mathcal{M}(A).$$

□

2.5 Spectra of locally convex algebras

The aim of this section is to construct in this section spectra of topological algebras similarly as did in [10] and [11] for topological algebras over $\mathbb{C}$, and to compare these spectra with our bornological spectra. We do not go in deep of a detailed study of general topological algebras over k, restricting our attention on the multiplicatively convex one for which we have a good notion of spectrum.

It's know that locally convex topological vector spaces can be seen as of pro-object of the category of seminormed spaces over k, in analogous way that bornological vector spaces can be seen as the ind-objects. So far we studied multiplicatively convex bornological algebras as ind-object of the category of seminormed algebras, hence here we want to explore the dual point of view: to study multiplicatively convex topological algebras as pro-object of the category of seminormed algebras.

Definition 2.5.1. *Let A be a locally convex k-vector space. We call A a* locally convex topological algebra *if A is equipped with a bilinear map $A \times A \to A$, which is continuous and has an identity. A morphism of locally convex algebras is a continuous ring homomorphism which preserve identities.*

All algebras we deal with are supposed to be commutative.

Definition 2.5.2. *Let A be a locally convex algebra, we say that A is* multiplicatively convex *if*

$$A \cong \varprojlim A_i$$

with A_i seminormed algebras where the system morphisms are algebra morphisms.

Definition 2.5.3. *Let A be a topological algebra, we define the* spectrum $\mathcal{M}(A)$ *of A as the set of continuous multiplicative seminorms on A which are compatible with the valuation on k,* i.e. *whose restriction on k is equal to the valuation. We endow it with the weak topology.*

Proposition 2.5.4. *Let $\mathcal{S}(A)$ be the set equivalence classes of continuous characters of A equipped with the weak topology, then we have the homeomorphism*

$$\mathcal{S}(A) \cong \mathcal{M}(A).$$

Proof. The proof is classical. Let's take a continuous character $\phi : A \to K$ to a complete valued field, then the valuation $|\cdot| : K \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ induces on A a seminorm. $|\cdot| \circ \phi$ is a continuous multiplicative seminorm on A. Now given two character $\phi_1 : A \to K_1$ and $\phi_2 : A \to K_2$, they induces two multiplicative seminorms $|\cdot|_1, |\cdot|_2 : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $|\cdot|_1 = |\cdot|_2$ if and only if there exist two isometric embedding $K_1 \hookrightarrow K$ and $K_2 \hookrightarrow K$ and an isometry $K \to K$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{\phi_1} & K_1 & \longrightarrow & K \\ & \searrow^{\phi_2} & & & \downarrow \\ & & K_2 & \longrightarrow & K \end{array},$$

i.e. if and only if ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are in the same class of continuous characters. Moreover, since A is a k-algebra we have that $k \to A \to K$ is a morphism of complete valued field, hence it must be an isometric embedding, since the spectrum of a complete valued field is a point. Therefore for any character ϕ the induces seminorm on A, $|\cdot| \circ \phi$ is compatible with the valuation on k.

On the other hand, given a continuous multiplicative seminorm $|\cdot| : A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$, then $|\cdot|^{-1}(0)$ is a closed prime ideal of A and we can extend $|\cdot|$ to a multiplicative norm on $K = \mathrm{Frac}\left(\frac{A}{|\cdot|^{-1}(0)}\right)$. So taking the completion of K we get a complete valued field $\widehat{K}$ and a character $\phi : A \to \widehat{K}$. In general this character is continuous but the embedding $k \hookrightarrow \widehat{K}$ may be not an isometric embedding. To ensure this we need to add the condition that $|\cdot|$ is compatible with the valuation on k.

These constructions are inverse of each other set-theoretically. Moreover, we saw that the continuity of the seminorm associated to a character is equivalent to the continuity of the character, hence the weak topologies that they define are the same. □

Remark 2.5.5. We would like to think of points of spectra as seminorms, as in Berkovich approach, but in this section we find ourself more comfortable thinking of points as characters.

Our next objective is to generalize lemma 7.1 of page 175 of [11] to the case of a general valued field, to relate the spectra of locally convex algebras with spectra of k-Banach algebras in a dual way as we did in the case of bornological algebras.

We say that a projective limit $A = \varprojlim_{i \in I} A_i$ is *cofiltered* if the set I is directed, and we say that is *cofiltrant* if I is linearly ordered and maps are injective. We also use the notation $\varphi_{i,j} : A_i \to A_j$ for a system morphism of the projective limit, for $j \leqslant i$ and $\pi_i : \varprojlim A_i \to A_i$ for the canonical morphisms.

In the case of locally convex algebras we need to impose on projective systems of normed algebras some more restrictive requirements to ensure good properties of their spectra, with respect of what we did in the case of bornological algebras.

Definition 2.5.6. *Let $A = \varprojlim_{i \in I} A_i$ be a cofiltered locally convex topological algebra, we say that A is a* dense projective algebra *if for any $i, j \in I$ with $i \leqslant j$ we have that*

$$\overline{\varphi_{j,i}(A_j)} = A_i.$$

We say that A is a strictly dense projective algebra *if it is a dense projective algebra and for any i the canonical map $\pi_i : \varprojlim A_i \to A_i$ has dense image.*

Theorem 2.5.7. *If $A = \varprojlim A_i$ is strictly dense projective algebra for which the morphisms $\varphi_{i,j}$ are injective then*

$$\mathcal{M}(A) \cong \varinjlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$$

is a homeomorphism of topological spaces.

Proof. The following proof is an adaptation of lemma 7.1, chapter V of [11]. First of all we notice that given the system $\varprojlim A_i$, by the theory of Berkovich spectrum of Banach rings we have an inductive system of topological spaces $\varinjlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$. So, we can define $\varinjlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ in the category of topological spaces and check that this is homeomorphic to our definition of $\mathcal{M}(A)$, under the hypothesis of the theorem.

Now, given any $\phi \in \mathcal{M}(A_i)$, we get $\phi \circ \pi_i \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. Moreover for any $j \leqslant i$ we also get that

$$\phi \circ \pi_i = \phi \circ \varphi_{j,i} \circ \pi_j$$

with $\phi \circ \varphi_{j,i} \in \mathcal{M}(A_j)$. This shows that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}(A) & & \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_j^*}\uparrow & \searrow^{\pi_i^*} & \\ \mathcal{M}(A_j) & \xleftarrow[\varphi_i^*]{} & \mathcal{M}(A_i) \end{array},$$

commutes. Hence, by the definition of colimit we have a unique map $h : \varinjlim \mathcal{M}(A_i) \to \mathcal{M}(A)$. Let's show that this map is injective. Let's take $u, v \in \varinjlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ and suppose that $h(u) = h(v)$. We may assume that $u = u_i$ and $v = v_i$ for $u_i, v_i \in \mathcal{M}(A_i)$, since the limit $\varinjlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ is filtered, given a $x = (x_i) \in \varprojlim A_i$ one has that

$$h(u)(x) = u_i(x_i), h(v)(x) = v_i(x_i).$$

So we get that $u_i = v_i$ on $\pi_i(A)$ and since $\overline{\pi_i(A)} = A_i$, by continuity we see that $u_i = v_i$ everywhere, obtaining injectivity.

Let's show surjectivity. Let $u \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. Then $u : A \to K$ is a continuous linear map between k vector space, and moreover K is a k-Banach space. This is equivalent to say (cf. Schaefer 1.1 page 75) that, if $\mathcal{P}$ is the family of seminorms that defines the topology on A, there exists a finite set $p_1, ..., p_n \in \mathcal{P}$ and a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\|u(x)\| \leqslant c \sup p_i(x)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the valuation on K. Let's take the topology generated by $p_1, ..., p_n$ on A, and denote this topological vector space by $\tilde{A}$. Since this is a finite family of seminorms then there exists a seminorm which induce the same topology of $p_1, ..., p_n$ and the identity $A \to \tilde{A}$ is a continuous map. Moreover, by hypothesis, all the canonical morphisms $\pi_i : A \to A_i$ are injective and since the topology on $\varprojlim A_i$ is given by the seminorm on A_i this mean that the elements of $\mathcal{P}$ are the restriction to A of the seminorm on A_i. And also, since this system is cofiltered for any finite sets of seminorm in $\mathcal{P}$ there exists a seminorm, in the family $\mathcal{P}$, which induces the topology given by this finite set of seminorms, *i.e.* $\tilde{A} \cong A_k$, for some k, as a topological vector space. Hence the map $u : A \to K$ factor through A_k, giving the result. □

Corollary 2.5.8. *Let A be a strictly dense projective algebra then $\mathcal{M}(A)$ depends only on the isomorphism class of A and not on the presentation of A as a projective limit.*

Proof. This is because the definition of A is intrinsic. □

Corollary 2.5.9. *Let A be a Fréchet algebra whose topology is not given by a single norm, then $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is hemicompact but not compact in general. This implies, in the case where the spectrum is not compact, that as bornological algebra there is no presentation of a Fréchet algebra of the form*

$$A = \varinjlim A_i$$

with A_i seminormed algebras, i.e. *Fréchet algebras, in general, are not multiplicatively convex in bornological sense.*

Proof. The algebras of holomorphic functions on the open polydisks in $\mathbb{C}^n$ are examples of such algebras with non-compact hemicompact spectra.

Moreover, $\mathcal{M}(A)$ corresponds to the equivalence classes of continuous characters to complete valued fields and for Fréchet algebras the notion of continuity and boundedness of a linear map are equivalent. Therefore the notion of bornologial spectrum of a Fréchet algebra and the notion of spectrum as locally convex algebra agree set-theoretically and also topologically. But we showed that the bornological spectrum of a multiplicatively convex bornological algebra must be compact and depends only on the isomorphism class of the algebra. □

Example 2.5.10.

1. In classical analytic geometry one has the theory of Stein spaces that can be thought as spectra of Stein algebras. Stein algebras have a canonical structure of Fréchet algebras, as for example the space of analytic functions over the open disk in $\mathbb{C}$, whose spectra, defined as above has a canonical structure of complex space which is isomorphic to the open disk in $\mathbb{C}$. Hence the association of Stein algebras to a Stein spaces gives an anti-equivalence between the category of Stein spaces and that of Stein algebras.

2. In [28] Berkovich introduced the affine space $\mathbb{A}^n_k$ over a non-archimedean field k as the set of bounded multiplicative seminorms over $k[X_1, ..., X_n]$ compatible with the valuation of k, and noticed that this space is homeomorphic to the space

$$\bigcup_{\rho>0} k\langle \rho^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho^{-1}X_n\rangle = \varinjlim_{\rho>0} k\langle \rho^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho^{-1}X_n\rangle.$$

It seems awkward to don't be able to see this space as spectrum of some topological algebra, and equipped with some nice topology. In fact we can do it noticing that we can define

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{A}^n_k) \doteq \varprojlim_{\rho>0} k\langle \rho^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho^{-1}X_n\rangle$$

and call it the *algebras of entire functions* on $\mathbb{A}^n_k$. This algebra is a Fréchet algebra over k and satisfies the hypothesis of theorem 2.5.7 hence

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{A}^n_k)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>0} k\langle \rho^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho^{-1}X_n\rangle \cong \mathbb{A}^n_k$$

coincides with Berkovich definition. Note also the analogy of this algebra with the Fréchet algebra $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ of entire holomorphic functions on $\mathbb{C}^n$. We shall analyze this with more care in the following.

Definition 2.5.11. *Let $\cdots \to A_i \to A_{i+1} \to \cdots$ be an inductive system of Fréchet algebras. We say that*

$$A \cong \varinjlim A_i$$

calculated in the category of multiplicatively convex topological algebras is an LF-algebra *if the limit is cofiltrant. We say that A is a* strict LF-algebra *if the morphisms are also strict. We use the terms LB if the Fréchet spaces are Banach.*

Definition 2.5.12. *Let A be an LF-algebra, we say that A is* LF-regular *if the underlying topological vector space is LF-regular.*

Proposition 2.5.13. *Let A be an LF-regular LF-algebra then*

1. *A is a normal bornological/topological vector space;*
2. *if A can be presented as an LB-algebra then there is a canonical homeomorphism $\mathcal{M}(A^b) \cong \mathcal{M}(A)$.*

Proof. 1. This is precisely the definition of LF-regular topological vector space which means that the canonical bornology of A coincides with the direct limit bornology.

2. If $A \cong \varinjlim A_i$, with A_i normed and A is regular then canonically $A^b \cong \varinjlim A_i^b$. Moreover, for normal bornological/topological vector spaces boundedness of linear maps is equivalent to continuity, hence a character from A to a valued field is continuous if and only if is bounded hence $\mathcal{M}(A^b) \cong \mathcal{M}(A)$, so also the spectrum of A is a compact, non-empty Hausdorff topological space.

□

We cannot hope to have a general result better than the previous proposition, as the following counter-example shows.

Example 2.5.14. We saw in example 2.1.33 (number 4 and 5) that there exist LF-regular LF-algebras with empty spectrum. So, we cannot relax the hypothesis that A possess a presentation as an LB-algebra.

Chapter 3

Dagger affinoid spaces

3.1 Overconvergent analytic functions on polydisks

Let k be an arbitrary complete valued field. Given any $\rho_1, ..., \rho_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we define

$$T_k^n(\rho) \doteq k\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle \doteq \left\{ \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}^n} a_i X^i \in k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \mid \lim_{i\to\infty} \sum_{\substack{j\in\mathbb{N}^n \\ i\leqslant|j|\leqslant i+l}} |a_j|\rho_1^{j_1}...\rho_n^{j_n} = 0, \forall l > 0 \right\}$$

with $j = (j_1, ..., j_n)$ a multi-index. We call it the *Tate algebra* on the polycylinder of radius $\rho = (\rho_1, ..., \rho_n)$. We notice that in the case of $k = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ we can identify any element of $T_k^n(\rho)$ with an analytic function on the respective open polycylinder, whose algebra is denoted by $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-))$, and by the identity theorem we have that the map

$$T_k^n(\rho) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-))$$

is injective. Moreover, we can consider on $T_k^n(\rho)$ the norm

$$|\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}^n} a_i X^i|_\rho \doteq \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}^n} |a_i|\rho_1^{i_1}...\rho_n^{i_n}$$

and $T_k^n(\rho)$ is a k-Banach algebra with respect to this norm (remember our conventions on summation symbols). So, for $f = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}^n} a_i X^i \in T_k^n(\rho)$ we have the estimate

$$\|f\| = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)} |f(x)| \leqslant |f|_\rho$$

hence given a Cauchy sequence $\{f_n\} \to f$ for $|\cdot|_\rho$ we see that

$$\|f_n - f_m\| \leqslant |f_n - f_m|_\rho \to 0,$$

therefore the convergence for $|\cdot|_\rho$ implies the uniform convergence. So we can deduce that for $K = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ any element in $T_k^n(\rho)$ define an analytic function in $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-)$ continuous on the border of the polycylinder. But in general, not all analytic function in $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-)$ which have a continuous extension to the border can be represented by a series of this kind.

Definition 3.1.1. *For any polyradius $\rho = (\rho_1, ..., \rho_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ we define*

$$W_k^n(\rho) = k\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle^\dagger \doteq \varinjlim_{r>\rho} T_k^n(r) = \bigcup_{r>\rho} T_k^n(r)$$

and call it the ring of overconvergent analytic functions *on the polycylinder of polyradius* $\rho = (\rho_1, ..., \rho_n)$ *centered in zero. Moreover, if* $\rho = (1, ..., 1)$ *we simply write*

$$W_k^n = k\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger$$

and call it the ring of overconvergent analytic functions *on the polydisk of radius* 1.

We put on $W_k^n(\rho)$ *the direct limit bornology induced by the k-Banach algebra structures on* $T_k^n(\rho)$*, and we call it the* canonical (or dagger) bornology *on* $W_k^n(\rho)$*.*

We use the notation W_k^n when we don't need to do specific explicit reference to the variables, otherwise we use the notation $k\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger$.

Remark 3.1.2. Our main objects of study will be the algebra W_k^n and its quotients. If k is trivially valued then $W_k^n = T_k^n(1) = k[X_1, ..., X_n]$, the Tate algebra of k and so our constructions will reduce to Berkovich theory. Hence we will suppose in the following that k is not trivially valued with in mind the fact that everything works in a easier way also if the valuation of k is trivial.

So from now on k is not trivially valued.

Proposition 3.1.3. $W_k^n(\rho)$ *is a complete bornological algebra.*

Proof. $W_k^n(\rho)$ is a filtrant direct limit of a family k-Banach algebras. We notice also that by choosing a monotonic strictly decreasing sequence $\rho_i \to \rho$ then $\varinjlim_{\{\rho_i\}} T_k^n(\rho_i) \cong W_k^n(\rho)$. In the following we often suppose tacitly to have chosen such a sequence. □

Remark 3.1.4. Is is easy to show that the functor ^{b} commutes with *strict* direct limits. In our case the maps of the system which defines W_k^n are not strict, since the image of $T_k^n(\rho)$ is dense in $T_k^n(\rho')$, for $\rho > \rho'$, and if the map was strict then it would be surjective since both algebras are complete. The issue of understanding if the functor ^{b} commutes with a countable limit

$$E = \varinjlim_{i\in\mathbb{N}} E_i$$

of Fréchet spaces with injective morphisms is a complicated and very much studied problem. It turns out that, even if one consider a direct limit of Banach spaces, the limit may not commute (see Khöte [4], 31.6). The condition that ^{b} commutes with the limit which defines the LF-algebra is called *regularity* in literature, and since we already reserved this word in the previous chapter (definition 2.4.5) we adopt the term *LF-regularity*. Finally, we call *LF-dagger structure* of *LF-dagger topology* or simply *dagger topology* the locally convex LF topological vector structure given to W_k^n by the system

$$(W_k^n)^t \cong (\varinjlim T_k^n(\rho))^t \cong \varinjlim T_k^n(\rho)^t.$$

Theorem 3.1.5. *The system*

$$(W_k^n(\rho))^t \cong (\varinjlim_{r>\rho} T_k^n(r))^t$$

*is compactoid (*i.e. *any morphism* $\varinjlim T_k^n(r) \hookrightarrow \varinjlim T_k^n(r')$ *is a compactoid map) hence* $W_k^n(\rho)$ *is a LF-regular bornological algebra with the dagger LF-structure.*

Remark 3.1.6. The concept of compactoid subset $X \subset E$ of locally convex topological vector space is defined in [6], definition 3.8.1. This concept is essential when one is dealing with functional analysis over a non-spherically complete field. Otherwise, the concept of compactoid subset reduces to the concept of relatively compact subset. Namely, the concept

of compactoid subset is precisely the generalization of relatively compact subset when the non-spherical completeness makes the base field to be non-locally compact. In this case relatively compactness lose its strength and usefulness and is precisely replaced by the concept of compactoidness in almost all argumentation which works in the same way, providing to change the words relatively compact with compactoid.

Proof. This is a known result, but scattered in literature specialized in the complex case or in the non-archimedean case. The non-archimedean case it's solved in [6], chapter 11, and the archimedean case can be deduced applying the results of Vogt in [7] or one can find the proof in [12]. We give here a proof for the sake of clarity.

So we deal with the case when k is spherically complete to explain the behaviour of the system maps, otherwise in [6] one can see the general proof in which one has to replace the concept of relatively compact with the concept of compactoid. Also, a proof of the fact that the colimit of a compact system is a LF-regular LF-space can be found in [8], corollary 8.5.25 for the archimedean case and in [6] theorem 11.3.5 for the non-archimedean (compactiod) version.

It's enough to show that for any $\rho > 1$ the canonical map $T_k^n(\rho) \to T_k^n$ is compact. Let's consider the set

$$B_\rho = \{f \in T_k^n(\rho) | \|f\|_\rho \leqslant 1\}.$$

We can write

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \rho^{-i} X^i$$

for a summable sequence $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_i| \leqslant 1$ for any $f \in B_\rho$. Let's take a sequence

$$\{f_j\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_{i,j} \rho^{-i} X^i \right\} \subset B_\rho.$$

We have to check that $\{f_j\}$ has a convergent subsequence in T_k^n. The sequences $a_{i,j}$, for fixed i and $j \to \infty$, are bounded sequence (bounded by 1) so we can extract a convergent subsequence $\tilde{a}_{i,j}$ for any i. Therefore we can define a subsequence

$$\{\tilde{f}_j\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \tilde{a}_{i,j} \rho^{-i} X^i \right\}$$

because we can always choose indexes in the appropriate way (continuing to extract convergent subsequence from bounded ones). If we denote $a_i = \lim_{j\to\infty} \tilde{a}_{i,j}$, by definition $\tilde{f}_j \to f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \rho^{-i} X^i$ in T_k^n and finally f is a well defined element of T_k^n since $|a_i| < 1$ for all i, hence

$$\| \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \rho^{-i} X^i \| = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_i| \rho^{-i} \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \rho^{-i} = \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} < \infty.$$

This shows that the image of B_ρ is relatively compact in T_k^n, so the system $(\varinjlim T_k^n(\rho))^t$ is compact. □

The previous theorem asserts the following relations of commutation of colimits with functors: if we equip W_k^n with the dagger bornology then

$$((W_k^n)^t)^b = ((\varinjlim T_k^n(\rho))^t)^b \cong (\varinjlim T_k^n(\rho)^t)^b \cong \varinjlim (T_k^n(\rho)^t)^b \cong W_k^n.$$

The preceding theorem has the following remarkable consequences.

Corollary 3.1.7. *$W_k^n(\rho)^t$ is a Hausdorff, nuclear, reflexive, complete, locally complete LF-algebra.*

Proof. This properties are common to all compactiod inductive limits: for the non-archimedean version see [6] 11.3.5; for the archimedean version see the paragraph 8.5 in [8]. □

We recall that as a consequence of the Khöthe open mapping theorem [5] for LF-space, we can deduce that if $\phi : (W_k^n(\rho))^t \to A$ is a continuous bijection to an LF-algebra, then ϕ is a topological isomorphism.

Corollary 3.1.8. *Let $\phi : W_k^n(\rho) \to A$ be a bounded bijection to a LF-regular LF-algebra, then ϕ is a bornological isomorphism.*

Proof. By functoriality we get a topological isomorphism $\phi^t : (W_k^n(\rho))^t \to A^t$ and now applying the functor ^{b} we get

$$W_k^n(\rho) \cong ((W_k^n(\rho))^t)^b \cong (A^t)^b \cong A.$$

□

Corollary 3.1.9. *Any direct filtrant system $\{E_n\}$ such that*

$$W_k^n(\rho) \cong \varinjlim E_n$$

is compactoid.

Proof. Cf. paragraph 8.5 in [8] and chapter 11 of [6]. □

In the third paragraph of this chapter we will study some other important systems whose direct limit is W_k^n. By the open mapping theorem we have that these systems are necessarily equivalent and is also interesting to underline that all these systems are compact, which is a quite strong requirement.

We notice that $W_k^n(\rho)$ is a regular bornological algebra in the sense of definition 2.4.5, and also satisfies the hypothesis of definition 2.3.20 hence we have the homeomorphism

$$\mathcal{M}(W_k^n(\rho)) \cong \mathcal{M}(T_k^n(\rho))$$

and moreover, if k is algebraically closed

$$\mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n(\rho)) \cong \mathrm{Max}\,(T_k^n(\rho)) \cong \mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-).$$

We use in the following lemmas and theorem the auxiliary results established in the appendix C.

Lemma 3.1.10. *Let $\overline{k}$ be an algebraic closure of k, then for any $M \in \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n)$ there exist an injection*

$$(W_k^n)_M \hookrightarrow \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$$

where $\overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$ is the $\overline{k}$ stellen-algebra center in $\overline{M} \in \mathbb{D}_{\overline{k}}((1,...,1)^+)$ which is a point over M.

Proof. We saw above that

$$\mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n) \cong \varprojlim_{\rho>1} \mathrm{Max}\,(T_k^n(\rho)) \cong \mathrm{Max}\,(T_k^n((1,...,1))).$$

So, if $\overline{k}$ is an algebraic closure of k then

$$\mathrm{Max}\,(T_k^n((1,...,1))) \cong \frac{\mathbb{D}_{\overline{k}}((1,...,1)^+)}{\mathrm{Gal}\,(\overline{k}/k)}$$

giving to $\frac{\mathbb{D}_{\overline{k}}((1,...,1)^+)}{\mathrm{Gal}\,(\overline{k}/k)}$ the quotient topology. It is known that $\overline{K}_n(\overline{M}) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\overline{k}^n,\overline{M}}$ the ring of germs of analytic functions at $\overline{M}$, and a well known consequence of the identity theorem is that

$$(W_k^n)_M \hookrightarrow K_n(M) \hookrightarrow \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$$

since any element of $(W_k^n)_M$ can be identified with an analytic function in a neighborhood of M. □

In the next when we take $M \in \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n)$ we also suppose to fix a $\overline{M} \in \mathbb{D}^n_{\overline{K}}(1^+)$ which is mapped on M by the canonical projection by the quotient with the Galois action.

Lemma 3.1.11. *Let $M \in \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n)$ and $I \subset (W_k^n)_M$ be an ideal, then there exists an ideal $J \subset \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$ such that*

$$I = (W_k^n)_M \cap J.$$

Proof. The ring homomorphism $(W_k^n)_M \hookrightarrow \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$ is a local homomorphism of Noetherian rings of dimension n. This mean that there exists a set of generators of the maximal ideal of $\overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$, $\mathfrak{m} = (f_1, ..., f_n)$ such that their preimage generate the maximal ideal of $(W_k^n)_M$. Since the morphism is injective, then $(W_k^n)_M$ contain a set of generators of $\mathfrak{m}$ and the maximal ideal of $(W_k^n)_M$ is generated by $(f_1, ..., f_n)$.

Now any ideal of $(W_k^n)_M$ and of $\overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$ is of the form $(P_1, ..., P_n)(W_k^n)_M$ for some polynomials $P_i \in (W_k^n)_M[f_1, ..., f_n]$, (cf. [44]), and

$$(P_1, ..., P_n)\overline{K}_n(\overline{M}) \cap (W_k^n)_M = (P_1, ..., P_n)(W_k^n)_M.$$

□

Theorem 3.1.12. *W_k^n is Noetherian, factorial and every ideal of W_k^n is closed for the direct limit bornology.*

Proof. That W_k^n is Noetherian and factorial is well known: in [17] there is what should be the first proof that W_k^n is Noetherian and in [18] the first proof that W_k^n is factorial in the archimedean case; for the non-archimedean case one can see [33]. So, let's show that all the ideals are bornologically closed.

For any $M \in \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n)$ we have that $W_k^n \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\overline{k}^n,\overline{M}} \cong \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$. Moreover by the previous lemmas we have also the inclusions

$$W_k^n \hookrightarrow (W_k^n)_M \hookrightarrow \overline{K}_n(\overline{M}).$$

If we put on W_k^n the dagger bornology and on $\overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$ the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness then the inclusion is a bounded map, since

$$\overline{K}_n(\overline{M}) = \varinjlim_{\rho>0} T^n_{\overline{k}}(\rho)[\overline{M}]$$

(where $T^n_{\overline{k}}(\rho)[\overline{M}]$ is the Tate algebra over $\overline{k}$ with radius ρ centered in $\overline{M}$) and the canonical map

$$W_k^n \to \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$$

is bounded, because of the maximum modulus principle. Moreover, the proposition C.0.16 implies that the identity $\overline{K}_n(\overline{M}) \to \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$ is bounded if we put on the domain the direct limit bornology and the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness in the codomain. Hence we get a bounded map $W_k^n \to \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$, which factor through the inclusion $(W_k^n)_M \hookrightarrow \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$. Then, $W_k^n \hookrightarrow (W_k^n)_M$ is bounded if we put on $(W_k^n)_M$ the bornolgy induced by the coefficientwise boundedness bornology on $\overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$. Moreover, all the ideals of $(W_k^n)_M$ are closed for the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness since by the previous lemma all the ideals

are of the form $(W_k^n)_M \cap J$ for $J \subset \overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$ and we know that all the ideals of $\overline{K}_n(\overline{M})$ are closed.

Therefore the preimage of all the ideals of $(W_k^n)_M$ in W_k^n are closed. But since W_k^n is Noetherian then any $I \subset W_k^n$ satisfies the relation

$$I = \bigcap_{M \in \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n)} I_M = \left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n)} I_M \right) \cap W_k^n =$$

$$= \bigcap_{M \in \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n)} (I_M \cap W_k^n) = \bigcap_{M \in \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n)} \phi_M^{-1}(I_M)$$

where $\phi_M : W_k^n \to (W_k^n)_M$ is the canonical injection and I_M is the extension of I to $(W_k^n)_M$. So I is an intersection of closed sets, hence is a closed set.

□

Remark 3.1.13. Notice that the same argument don't applies to $T_k^n(\rho)$ since the ideals of $T_k^n(\rho)$ are not finitely generated, and so not all localization of $T_k^n(\rho)$ are Noetherian. Furthermore it's known that not all ideals of $T_k^n(\rho)$ are closed, neither the finitely generated nor the principal ones. In fact, one can show that an $\mathbb{R}$-Banach algebra on which every principal ideal is closed is a division algebra.

Proposition 3.1.14. *Let $\mathcal{I}_{T_k^n(\rho)}$ denote the lattice of closed ideals of $T_k^n(\rho)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{W_k^n}$ the lattice of ideals of W_k^n, then*

$$\mathcal{I}_{W_k^n} \cong \varprojlim_{\rho > 1} \mathcal{I}_{T_k^n(\rho)}$$

where the map of the system are given by

$$I_\rho \mapsto I_\rho \cap T_k^n(\rho')$$

for $\rho' > \rho$.

Proof. Let $I \subset W_k^n$ be an ideal, this mean that I is a subspace of W_k^n and I is closed by multiplication by elements of W_k^n. We can define a map $\mathscr{P}(W_k^n) \to \mathscr{P}(T_k^n(\rho))$ mapping a subset $S \subset W_k^n$ to $S \cap T_k^n(\rho)$. If we consider the ideal I we have for each ρ a subset $I \cap T_k^n(\rho) \subset T_k^n(\rho)$ which is an ideal of $T_k^n(\rho)$. Since any element of I must be in $T_k^n(\rho)$, for some $\rho > 1$ we see that

$$I = \bigcup_{\rho > 1} I \cap T_k^n(\rho) = \varinjlim_{\rho > 1} I \cap T_k^n(\rho).$$

Given an ideal $I \subset W_k^n$, we know that this ideal is closed and so $I \cap T_k^n(\rho)$ is a closed ideal of $T_k^n(\rho)$.

On the other hand, take a filtrant system of closed ideals $I_\rho \subset T_k^n(\rho)$. Their limit

$$I = \varinjlim_{\rho > 1} I_\rho = \bigcup_{\rho > 1} I \cap T_k^n(\rho)$$

is an ideal of W_k^n. In fact, I is clearly a subspace of W_k^n and for each $a \in W_k^n$ and $x \in I$ we have that there exists a ρ such that both $a, x \in T_k^n(\rho)$ and so $ax \in I_\rho \Rightarrow ax \in I$. Moreover, I is bornologically closed because W_k^n carries the direct limit bornology. So a sequence $\{x_n\} \subset W_k^n$ converge in W_k^n if and only if there exists a bounded subset B such that $\{x_n\} \subset \lambda B$ for all $n > N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. But $B \subset T_k^n(\rho)$ for some $\rho > 1$, hence $\{x_n\}$ converge to an element of $T_k^n(\rho)$ with respect to the norm of $T_k^n(\rho)$.

This shows that we have two maps $\sigma : \mathcal{I}_{W_k^n} \to \varprojlim_{\rho > 1} \mathcal{I}_{T_k^n(\rho)}$ and $\tau : \varprojlim_{\rho > 1} \mathcal{I}_{T_k^n(\rho)} \to \mathcal{I}_{W_k^n}$, since elements of $\mathcal{I}_{T_k^n(\rho)}$ are precisely systems of closed ideals. These maps are clearly inverse of each other and preserve the orderings hence they are isomorphisms of ordered sets. Hence any ideal of W_k^n can be written as a system of closed ideals. □

Proposition 3.1.15. *Let $I \subset W_k^n$ be an ideal then W_k^n/I is a complete bornological algebra. Morevover if $I = (f_1, ..., f_r)$ then we can write*

$$\frac{W_n}{I} \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \left(\frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{\overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}} \right),$$

for ρ small enough.

Proof. Since $I = (f_1, ..., f_r)$ is finitely generated there must exists a $\rho' > 1$ such that $f_i \in T_k^n(\rho)$ for each $\rho < \rho'$ and since

$$\varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho>1} T_k^n(\rho) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} T_k^n(\rho)$$

we can suppose that $f_i \in T_k^n(\rho)$ for all ρ. We have two maps: the canonical epimorphism

$$\pi : \varinjlim_{\rho>1} T_k^n(\rho) \to \frac{\varinjlim_{\rho>1} T_k^n(\rho)}{I}$$

and the map

$$\alpha : \varinjlim_{\rho>1} T_k^n(\rho) \to \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \left(\frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{\overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}} \right)$$

(where $(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho$ is the ideal of $T_k^n(\rho)$ generated by $f_1, ..., f_r$) induced by the system morphisms

$$\alpha_\rho : T_k^n(\rho) \to \frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{\overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}}.$$

α is surjective because $\varinjlim$ is an exact functor. We have to show that $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\alpha) = I$. By exactness of $\varinjlim$ we have that $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\alpha) = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}$, hence we are reduced to show that

$$I = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}.$$

If $f \in I$ then $f = f_1 a_1 + ... + f_r a_r$ for $a_i \in W_k^n$ hence there exists a $\rho' > 1$ for which $f \in T_k^n(\rho')$ therefore $f \in \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}$. On the other hand it's clear that $\varinjlim_{\rho>1} (f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho \subset I$ and since I is closed then $\overline{\varinjlim_{\rho>1} (f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho} \subset I$. So we need to show that

$$\varinjlim_{\rho>1} \overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho} \subset \overline{\varinjlim_{\rho>1} (f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}.$$

If $h \in \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}$ then there exists a sequence of element $\{h_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with

$$h_i \in (f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho$$

such that $h_i \to h$, but $h_i \in \varinjlim_{\rho>1} (f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho$ for any i and so $h \in \overline{\varinjlim_{\rho>1} (f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}$, by the definition of bornological convergence.

This shows the algebraic isomorphism. To see that this isomorphism is also bornogical we notice that

$$I \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}$$

as bornological k-vector spaces, because the inclusion $I \subset W_k^n$ gives to I the direct limit bornology. Hence $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\alpha) \cong \mathrm{Ker}\,(\pi)$ bornologically. □

3.2 The category of dagger affinoid algebras

Definition 3.2.1. *A* strict k-dagger affinoid algebra *is a complete bornological algebra which is isomorphic to a quotient W_k^n/I, with I ideal. We denote by $\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger$ the full subcategory of $\mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)$ whose objects are strict k-dagger affinoid algebras and whose morphisms are bounded algebra morphisms.*

Proposition 3.2.2. *If A is a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra then A is a complete bornological algebra whose ideals are all closed.*

Proof. A inherits the quotient bornology from W_k^n. With this bornology A is a complete bornological algebra with well defined spectrum by the previous proposition. Then, suppose that $I \subset A$ is a non-closed ideal of A then A/I is a non-separated bornological algebra and the composition $W_k^n \to A \to A/I$ is a surjective morphism of W_k^n to a non-separated bornological algebra, hence the preimage of I is a non-closed ideal of W_k^n, which doesn't exists. Hence all ideals of A are closed. □

Proposition 3.2.3. *Every dagger algebra is LF-regular.*

Proof. We showed that W_k^n is defined by a compact (or compactoid if k is not spherically complete) direct limit. If $A \cong \frac{W_k^n}{I}$ and we equip A with the quotient topology then we have that

$$A \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{T_k^n(\rho) \cap I},$$

by the open mapping theorem for LF-spaces. Let $X \subset T_k^n(\rho)$ be an open subset such that $\varphi_{\rho,\rho'}(X) \subset Y \subset T_k^n(\rho')$ for Y compact in $T_k^n(\rho')$ then $\pi_\rho(X) \subset \frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{I \cap T_k^n(\rho)}$ is an open subset in $\frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{I \cap T_k^n(\rho)}$ because π_ρ is a strict morphism and $\pi_{\rho'}(Y) \subset \frac{T_k^n(\rho')}{I \cap T_k^n(\rho')}$ is compact (where $\varphi_{\rho,\rho'}$ denotes the system morphisms of A and $\pi_\rho : T_k^n(\rho) \to \frac{T_k^n(\rho')}{I \cap T_k^n(\rho')}$ the quotient map). Moreover, we have that

$$\varphi_{\rho,\rho'}(\pi_\rho(X)) \subset \pi_{\rho'}(Y)$$

hence the system of definition of A is compact. □

Hence we have the following corollary, which sum up the analogous corollaries to the theorem 3.1.5

Corollary 3.2.4. *Let A be a dagger algebra then:*

1. *A^t is Hausdorff, nuclear, reflexive, complete, locally complete LF-algebra;*
2. *let $\phi : A^t \to B$ be a continuous bijection to an LF-algebra, then ϕ is a topological isomorphism;*
3. *let $\phi : A \to B$ be a bounded bijection to a LF-regular LF-algebra, then ϕ is a bornological isomorphism;*
4. *any direct filtrant system $\{E_n\}$ such that $A \cong \varinjlim E_n$ is compactoid.*

Proof. □

Proposition 3.2.5. *Every dagger algebra is regular as bornological algebra.*

Proof. Given a dagger algebra A the proposition is deduced from the presentation

$$A \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}$$

for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_1, \ldots, f_r \in W_k^n$ and 2.3.20. □

For the next result we need a lemma which is a generalization of the proposition 3.7.5 of [26]. We give it at the maximal generality that we can prove it, and to do it we recall a couple of defintions from [23].

Definition 3.2.6. *Let E be a separated bornological vector space of convex type. A pair (V, b) consisting of mappings $V : \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{N}^k \to \mathscr{P}(E)$ and $b : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}_{>0}$ is called a* bornological web *if all of the conditions below hold:*

1. *The image of V consists of disks.*
2. *$V(\varnothing) = E$.*
3. *Given a finite sequence $(n_0, \ldots, n_k)$, every point in $V(n_0, \ldots, n_k)$ is absorbed by*
$$\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} V(n_0, \ldots, n_k, n).$$
4. *For every $s : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ the series $\sum_k b(s)_k x_k$ converges bornologically in E, whenever we choose $x_k \in V(s(0), \ldots, s(k))$.*

A separated bornological vector space of convex type E which is endowed with a bornological web is called a webbed convex bornological space.

The concept of webbed bornological vector space is very general and it's easy to show that dagger algebras are webbed (for example one can use point 3 of theorem 4.11 of [23]). Then, we have the lemma.

Lemma 3.2.7. *Let A, B be bornological algebras whose underlying bornological vector space is a webbed bornological vector space and let $\phi : A \to B$ be an algebra morphism. Suppose that in B there is a family of ideals $\mathcal{I}$ such that*

1. *each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ is closed in B and each $\phi^{-1}(I)$ is closed in A;*
2. *for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ one has $\dim_k B/I < \infty$;*
3. *$\bigcap_{I\in\mathcal{I}} I = (0)$.*

Then ϕ is bounded.

Proof. Let's denote $\beta : B \to B/I$ the residue epimorphism and $\psi = \beta \circ \phi$. Let $\overline{\psi} : A/\mathrm{Ker}\,(\psi) \to B/I$ denote the canonical injection, which give us the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\phi} & B \\ \downarrow & \overset{\psi}{\searrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta} \\ A/\mathrm{Ker}\,(\psi) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\psi}} & B/I \end{array}.$$

Moreover, we have that $\mathrm{Ker}\,(\psi) = \phi^{-1}(I)$. Hence by hypothesis B/I and $A/\mathrm{Ker}\,(\psi)$ are finite dimensional separated bornological algebras, when they are equipped with the quotient bornology. Therefore, as bornological vector spaces, they are isomorphic to the direct

product of some copies of k. So, $\overline{\psi}$ is known to be bounded and this implies the boundedness of ψ.

Now we can derive the theorem using the closed graph theorem for webbed bornological vector space (cf. [23]). So, let's take a sequence $\{a_n\} \subset A$ such that $\lim a_n = 0$, bornologically, and for which $\lim \phi(a_n) = b$. Then

$$\beta(b) = \beta(\lim \phi(a_n)) = \lim(\beta \circ \phi)(a_n)$$

since β is bounded, hence

$$\lim(\beta \circ \phi)(a_n) = \lim \psi(a_n) = \psi(\lim a_n) = 0$$

which implies that $b \in I$. But this must be true for any $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\bigcap_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I = (0)$ implies that ϕ is bounded. □

Theorem 3.2.8. *Let $A, B \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger)$ and $\phi : A \to B$ an algebra morphism, then ϕ is bounded.*

Proof. It's enough to show that every strict k-dagger algebra fulfils the conditions of the previous lemma. So let's take the family of ideals of B given by

$$\mathcal{I} = \{\mathfrak{m}^e | e \geqslant 1, \mathfrak{m} \text{ is maximal in } B\}.$$

We know all ideals of A and B are closed and that $B/\mathfrak{m}^e$ is a finite dimensional k-vector space. We have to check that

$$\bigcap_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I = 0$$

but this is a classical conseguence of Krull intersection lemma. □

The previous theorem is analogous the well know result in the theory of affinoid algebras or in the theory of Grosse-Klönne dagger algebras, but we can show more.

Theorem 3.2.9. *Let $\phi : A \to B$ an algebra morphism and $k \neq \mathbb{R}$, then ϕ is strongly bounded, with respect to the monad of weakly-power-bounded elements.*

Proof. If k is non-archimedean case it is well known and is a direct consequence of proposition 1.3.26.

The proof of the general case is the same of proposition 2.4.3: by the previous proposition we known that ϕ is bounded, hence for any $f \in A$ we have that $|\phi(f)(x)| = |f(\phi^*(x))|$ for any $x \in \mathcal{M}(B)$. So, if for $f_1, ..., f_n \in A$ we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_i(x)|, \forall x \in \mathcal{M}(A) \leqslant 1 \iff (f_i) \in \Sigma_{A^\circ}(\mathbf{n})$$

by lemma 2.4.1, hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\phi(f_i)(x)| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_i(\phi^*(x))| \leqslant 1, \forall x \in \mathcal{M}(B)$$

which (always for lemma 2.4.1) implies $(\phi(f_i)) \in \Sigma_{B^\circ}(\mathbf{n})$. □

Remark 3.2.10. By the definition of strongly bounded morphism the previous theorem says that any dagger algebra morphism give rise to a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_A & \xrightarrow{f} & \Sigma_B \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \Sigma_{A^\diamond} & \xrightarrow{f^\diamond} & \Sigma_{B^\diamond} \end{array} .$$

in the category of algebraic monads. This stronger condition than simply the boundedness seems to shows the geometric nature of morphisms of dagger algebras and gives us the hint of some more deep relations with the theory of generalized rings of Durov which we have no time to investigate here in this thesis. One can wonders if the theory of Durov can be used to develop some sort of analog of formal geometry also in the case where the base field is archimedean, where formal models of analytic spaces are no more formal schemes but suitable kind of generalized rings over

$$k^\circ[X_1, \dots, X_n] = \{\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i X^i | \sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i| \leqslant 1\}$$

analogous to the models used by Durov in its researches on Arakelov geometry. Since this kind of models are already proved to be useful in Durov thesis is seems worth to see if one can explain this theory in a better fashion with some sort of generalized Raynuad formal geometry.

Dagger algebras morphisms have also nice relations with respect to the natural filtrations that they are endowed.

Lemma 3.2.11. *Let $\rho = (\rho_1, ..., \rho_n)$ with $\rho_i \in \sqrt{k^\times}$ then there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a surjective bounded algebra morphism*

$$T_k^m = T_k^m(1) \to T_k^n(\rho)$$

whose kernel is a finitely generated ideal of T_k^m.

Proof. The proof for the non-archimedean case is in [26] 6.1.5/4. The same proof in the archimedean case shows that there is an isomorphism

$$T_k^n \to T_k^n(\rho)$$

for any ρ. □

In the following proposition we follow the convention of choosing a base of neighborhoods of the closed polydisk $(1, \dots, 1)$ made of polydisks of the form $(\rho, \dots, \rho)$ for $\rho > 1$.

Proposition 3.2.12. *Let*

$$\phi : A = \frac{W_k^n}{(f_1, ..., f_r)} \to B = \frac{W_k^m}{(g_1, ..., g_s)}$$

be a morphism a k-dagger algebras. Then there exists ρ_A and ρ_B such that

$$A \cong \varinjlim_{1<\rho<\rho_A} \frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho} = \varinjlim A_\rho$$

$$B \cong \varinjlim_{1<\rho<\rho_B} \frac{T_k^m(\rho)}{(g_1,...,g_s)_\rho} = \varinjlim B_\rho,$$

for each $\rho \in \sqrt{k^\times}$ *with* $\rho < \rho_A$ *and* $\rho < \rho_B$ *there exist a* ρ' *such that the canonical morphism*

$$A_\rho \to A \to B$$

fatorize through

$$B_{\rho'} \to B.$$

Proof. For the non-archimedean case this is done by G-K. Let's check the archimedean case, which is solved by the same reasoning. We have the following morphisms:

$$T_k^n \xrightarrow{\sim} T_k^n(\rho) \to A_\rho \to A \xrightarrow{\phi} B.$$

Let's denote the composition $T_k^n = k\langle X_1,...,X_n\rangle \to B$ with the symbol α. Since it is a composition of bounded morphisms we have that $\alpha(X_i) \in B$ is power-bounded for each i and so there exists a ρ' with $\alpha(X_i) \in B_{\rho'}$ (since they are a finite number). So we have that

$$\phi(A_\rho) = \alpha(T_k^n) \subset B_{\rho'} \to B$$

which proves the proposition. □

Corollary 3.2.13. *Let* $\phi : A \to B$ *be an algebra homomorphism between dagger affinoid algebras then* ϕ *"preserve the filtration". So, if we think to dagger algebras as ind-objects of the category of seminormed algebras, this result says that to give an algebra morphism is tantamount to give a morphism of* A *and* B *as ind-objects.*

Proof. □

We can restate the previous corollary in the following way.

Corollary 3.2.14. *The following diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger & \xrightarrow{\ i\ } & \mathbf{Ind}(\mathbf{Sn}(\mathbf{Alg}_k)) \\ & \searrow^{j} & \downarrow \\ & & \mathbf{Born}(\mathbf{Alg}_k) \end{array}$$

is commutative and the immersions i *and* j*are fully faithful.*

Proof. □

As we noticed, the definition of W_k^n is a particular case of the definition of the ring of bornological overconvegent power series, that we gave so far. Moreover, the notation that we are using is consistent with the one used in the previous chapter. Hence we can state the universal property characterizing W_k^n:

Proposition 3.2.15. *Given any complete bornological algebra* A *and* $a_1,...,a_n \in A^\diamond$ *weakly power-bounded elements, there exists a unique morphism*

$$\Phi : W_k^n = k\langle X_1,...,X_n\rangle^\dagger \to A$$

such that $X_i = a_i$.

In particular if $\Phi : k\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger \to A$ is a strict epimorphism (and hence A is a dagger algebra) we say that $f_1 = \Phi(X_1), ..., f_n = \Phi(X_n)$ are a *system of generators* of A and we write

$$A = k\langle f_1, ..., f_n\rangle^\dagger.$$

The category of strict k-dagger algebras has tensor products, which are the object representing coproducts and push-outs. Given two morphism of k-dagger algebras $A \to B$ and $A \to C$ we define

$$B \otimes_A^\dagger C \doteq B\widehat{\otimes}_A C$$

as the completion of the projective bornological tensor product of the tensor product of B and C, over k, modulo the ideal generated by element of the form

$$(ab) \otimes c - b \otimes (ac)$$

for $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$.

Remark 3.2.16. We showed that dagger algebras are nuclear. It's known that for nuclear bornological vector spaces there is only one possible bornology to put on $B \otimes_k C$, *i.e.* if we consider the lattice of all the tensor product bornologies on $B \otimes_k C$, whose top is the projective one and whose bottom is the injective tensor product bornology, then the bornological vector spaces obtained by putting on $B \otimes_k C$ these two bornologies are isomorphic. This mean that no matter how we like to describe a tensor product bornology on $B \otimes_k C$, every (well defined) one gives the same result.

Proposition 3.2.17. *Let $A \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger)$ then there is an isomorphism*

$$A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger \to A \otimes_k^\dagger W_k^n.$$

Proof. It's enough to show that both algebras satisfy the same universal property in the category of complete bornological algebras. We know the universal property of $A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger$. Now, let's take a morphism $\phi : A \to B$ and n elements $b_1, ..., b_n \in B^\diamond$. By the universal property of W_k^n there exists a unique morphism $\psi : W_k^n \to B$ such that $\psi(X_i) = b_i$. And finally, by the universal property of the tensor product there exists a unique morphism γ which makes the following diagram commutative



where α_i are the canonical maps of the tensor product. Therefore $A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger$ and $A \otimes_k^\dagger W_k^n$ share the same universal property and so they are isomorphic. □

Corollary 3.2.18.

$$W_k^n \otimes_k^\dagger W_k^m \cong W_k^{n+m}$$

and if k'/k is an extension of complete valued fields then

$$W_{k'}^n \cong W_k^n \otimes_k^\dagger k'.$$

Proof. It's easy to show the isomorphisms by checking universal properties. □

Proposition 3.2.19. *Let A, B, C be strict k-dagger affinoid algebras and $A \to B$, $A \to C$ two morphism, then*

$$B \otimes^{\dagger}_{A} C$$

is a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra.

Proof. There are strict epimorphisms $W^n_k \to A$, $W^m_k \to B$, $W^p_k \to C$ and $B \otimes^{\dagger}_k C \to B \otimes^{\dagger}_A C$. We then get strict epimorphisms

$$W^m_k \otimes_k W^p_k \to B \otimes_k C \to B \otimes_A C.$$

and by the isomorphism $W^m_k \otimes^{\dagger}_k W^p_k \to W^{m+p}_k$ the strict empimorphisms

$$W^{m+p}_k \to B \otimes^{\dagger}_k C \to B \otimes^{\dagger}_A C.$$

□

Proposition 3.2.20. *The category $\mathbf{Aff}^{\dagger}_k$ has finite direct products.*

Proof. The ring-theoretic direct product has the desired property. Algebrically there is nothing to show, we have only to check that $W^n_k \oplus W^m_k$ is an object of $\mathbf{Aff}^{\dagger}_k$. To see this we notice that we can suppose $n = m$ (since we have to find an epimorphism) and so the map $W^n_k\langle X\rangle^{\dagger} \to W^n_k \oplus W^n_k$ defined

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i Y^i \mapsto (a_0, \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i)$$

is a bounded (hence strict) epimorphism. □

Proposition 3.2.21. *Let $B \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Aff}^{\dagger}_k)$ and $\varphi : B \to A$ a bounded finite morphism to a complete bornological algebra A then $A \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Aff}^{\dagger}_k)$.*

Proof. We may assume $B = W^n_k$, since B is an epimorphic image of some W^n_k and we have to find an epimorphism from some W^n_k to A. The assumption that $\varphi : B \to A$ is finite means that A is a finite B-module with respect to the module structure given by φ, hence

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varphi(B) a_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varphi(W^n_k) a_i$$

for some $a_i \in A$, and we may assume $a_i \in A^{\circ}$. Now we can consider $W^n_k\langle X_1, ..., X_m\rangle^{\dagger} \cong W^{m+n}_k$ and by its universal property, we can find

$$\Phi : W^{m+n}_k \to A$$

such that $\Phi(X_i) = a_i$ for each i. Therefore Φ is surjective and bounded, showing that A is an object of $\mathbf{Aff}^{\dagger}_k$. □

We gave the definition

$$A\langle X\rangle^{\dagger} = \varinjlim_{\rho > 1} A\langle \rho^{-1} X_i\rangle$$

for a bornological algebra with well defined spectrum. It is now clear that we can work out other similar constructions, and for example we can define

$$A\langle X^{-1}\rangle^{\dagger} \doteq A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^{\dagger} \doteq \varinjlim_{\substack{\rho > 1 \\ i \in I}} A_i\langle \rho^{-1} X_i, \rho^{-1} X_i^{-1}\rangle$$

The algebra $A\langle X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ satisfies the following universal property: given any complete bornological algebra B, a unit $f \in B$ such that $f^{-1} \in B^\diamond$ and a morphism $\phi : A \to B$, then there exists a unique morphism

$$\Phi : A\langle X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to B$$

such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X) = f$. We can also define

$$A\langle X\rangle^\dagger\langle Y^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$$

where now $X = (X_1, ..., X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, ..., Y_m)$ and verify that this algebra satisfies the following universal property: given any complete bornological algebra B, and $f_1, ..., f_n \in B$ and units $g_1, ..., g_m \in B$ such that $f_i, g_j^{-1} \in B^\diamond$ and a morphism $\phi : A \to B$, then there exists a unique morphism

$$\Phi : A\langle X\rangle^\dagger\langle Y^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to B$$

such that $\Phi|_A = \phi$ and $\Phi(X_i) = f_i$ and $\Phi(Y_i) = g_i$. Moreover checking the universal properties we can see that there exists a unique isomorphism

$$A\langle X\rangle^\dagger\langle Y^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to A\langle X, Y^{-1}\rangle^\dagger.$$

If A is an object of $\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger$, we know that $A\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger)$. Hence we see that there is a canonical epimorphism

$$A\langle X_1, X_2\rangle^\dagger \to A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$$

which shows that also $A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ is a strict dagger affinoid algebra and more generally

$$A\langle X, Y^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$$

for $X = (X_1, ..., X_n)$ and $Y = (Y_1, ..., Y_m)$ is a strict dagger affinoid algebra.

Now let's take a $A \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger)$, and elements $f = (f_1, ..., f_n), g = (g_1, ..., g_m)$ of A. Following classical rigid geometry define the following algebra

$$A\langle f, g^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \doteq \frac{A\langle X, Y\rangle^\dagger}{(X - f, gY - 1)}.$$

It is clear that $A\langle f, g^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ is a strict dagger affinoid algebra, which satisfies the following universal property.

Proposition 3.2.22. *Let $\varphi : A \to B$ be a homomorphism between strict k-dagger affinoid algebras, such that $\varphi(g_j)$ are units and $\varphi(f_i), \varphi(g_j)^{-1} \in B^\diamond$, then there exists a unique morphism $\psi : A\langle f, g^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to B$ for which the diagram*



commutes.

Proof. By the definition of $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger$ and that of quotient. □

Now we can mimic another classical construction. Given $g, f_1, ..., f_n \in A$ with no common zeros, we define

$$A\left\langle \frac{f}{g} \right\rangle^\dagger \doteq \frac{A\langle X\rangle^\dagger}{(gX - f)}.$$

It is clear that $A\langle \frac{f}{g}\rangle^\dagger$ is a strict dagger affinoid algebra, which satisfies the following universal property.

Proposition 3.2.23. *Let $\varphi : A \to B$ be a homomorphism between strict k-dagger affinoid algebras, such that the elements $\frac{\varphi(f_i)}{\varphi(g_j)} \in B^\diamond$, then there exists a unique morphism $\psi : A\left\langle \frac{f}{g} \right\rangle^\dagger \to B$ for which the diagram*



commutes.

Proof. □

In order to understand Berkovich geometry from a dagger perspective, we introduce the notion of non-strict dagger affinoid algebra.

Definition 3.2.24. *A (non-strict) k-*dagger affinoid algebra *is a bornological algebra which is isomorphic to a quotient*

$$\frac{k\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle^\dagger}{I} = \frac{W_k^n(\rho = (\rho_1, ..., \rho_n))}{I}$$

where $\rho_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We consider on $W_k^n(\rho)$ the direct limit bornology.

We denote the category of all k-dagger affinoid algebra with $\mathbf{GAff}_k^\dagger$ with bounded algebra morphisms morphisms.

Lemma 3.2.25. *Let K/k be an extension of complete valued fields and $A \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger)$, then $A \otimes_k^\dagger K \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Aff}_K^\dagger)$.*

Proof. Let $W_k^n \to A$ be the canonical epimorphism then by the functoriality of the dagger tensor product we have a morphism $W_k^n \otimes_k^\dagger K \to A \otimes_k^\dagger K$, and we showed that $W_k^n \otimes_k^\dagger K \cong W_K^n$. The lemma is proved noticing that $\otimes_k^\dagger$ is right exact. □

Proposition 3.2.26. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra, then there exists a finitely generated extension K/k of complete valued fields such that*

$$A \otimes_k^\dagger K$$

is a strict K-dagger affinoid algebra.

Proof. We note that only in the non-archimedean case one can meet non-strict algebras. By definition

$$A \cong \frac{k\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle^\dagger}{I}.$$

and let us take K a complete valued extension of k with $\rho_i \in \sqrt{|K^\times|}$, for all i. It is enough to show that

$$k\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle^\dagger \otimes_k^\dagger K \cong W_K^n(\rho)$$

is a strict K-dagger affinoid algebra because we get a surjection (since tensor product is right exact)

$$k\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle^\dagger \otimes_k^\dagger K \to \frac{k\langle \rho_1^{-1}X_1, ..., \rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle^\dagger}{I} \otimes_k^\dagger K.$$

So

$$k\langle\rho_1^{-1}X_1,...,\rho_n^{-1}X_n\rangle^\dagger\otimes_k^\dagger K=(\varinjlim_{\lambda>\rho_1}T_k(\lambda))\otimes_k^\dagger...\otimes_k^\dagger(\varinjlim_{\lambda>\rho_n}T_k(\lambda))\otimes_k^\dagger K\cong$$

$$\cong\varinjlim_{\lambda_1>\rho_1,...,\lambda_n>\rho_n}\left(T_k(\lambda_1)\widehat{\otimes}_k...\widehat{\otimes}_kT_k(\lambda_n)\widehat{\otimes}_kK\right)\cong$$

$$\varinjlim_{\lambda_1>\rho_1,...,\lambda_n>\rho_n}\left(T_K(\lambda_1)\widehat{\otimes}_K...\widehat{\otimes}_KT_K(\lambda_n)\right)\cong(\varinjlim_{\lambda>\rho_1}T_K(\lambda))\otimes_K^\dagger...\otimes_K^\dagger(\varinjlim_{\lambda>\rho_n}T_K(\lambda))\cong W_K^n(\rho)$$

where with $\widehat{\otimes}$ we denote the complete projective tensor product. □

Hence we can often reduce problems of dagger algebras to problems of strict dagger algebras by tensoring with a suitable finitely generated extension of k as Berkovich did in its foundation of affinoid algebras theory.

Proposition 3.2.27. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra. All the ideal of A are closed for the dagger bornology.*

Proof. Only in the non-archimedean case we can find non-strict dagger algebras, and in this case the result follows easily from [28] proposition 2.1.3. □

In the same way, by reduction to the affinoid case, one can check that all morphisms of non-strict dagger algebras are bounded.

3.3 Complex dagger algebras as Ind-Stein algebras

We now define three different filtration in W_k^n and study the relations between them. These filtrations need to be studied only in the archimedean case being the link to Stein algebras theory, while in the non-archimedean case they don't give any new information with respect to what did so far. So, in this section, we are always supposing that k is archimedean,

We denote the closed polycylinder of polyradius $\rho=(\rho_1,...,\rho_n)$ with $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)$. It has a neighborhood basis formed by the open polycylinders of radius $\rho'=(\rho'_1,...,\rho'_n)$ with $\rho'_i>\rho_i$ for all i. On any open polycylinder $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-)$ we can consider three natural function algebras: the algebra of summable power-series

$$T_k^n(\rho')$$

the algebra of holomorphic functions

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))$$

and the disk algebra

$$D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))=\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))\cap\mathscr{C}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+))$$

where $\mathscr{C}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+))$ is the ring of continuous functions on $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)$. These algebras are in the following set-theoretic relations

$$T_k^n(\rho')\subset D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))\subset\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))$$

and every inclusion is strict in general (*i.e.* not every holomorphic function has a continuous extension to the border of the polycylinder and not every function which is holomorphic inside the polycylinder and continuous on the border can be represented by a summable power-series).

By definition, as a set, the ring of germs of analytic functions on $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+))=\varinjlim_{V\supset\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)\atop\text{open}}\mathcal{O}(V)$$

and since the open polycylinders $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-)$ of polyradius $\rho' > \rho$ form a neighborhood basis for $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)$, we can write

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)) = \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho')^-).$$

Then, given any $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+))$ we can always find a $\rho' > \rho$ such that $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))$ and moreover a $\rho' > \rho'' > \rho$ such that $f \in T_k^n(\rho'') \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho''^-))$, *i.e.* $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-)) \subset T_k^n(\rho'')$. So, set-theoretically we have the identification

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} T_k^n(\rho').$$

Then the inclusions

$$T_k^n(\rho') \subset D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-)) \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))$$

give also the other bijections of sets

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)) = \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} T_k^n(\rho') \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)).$$

Moreover, we notice that the bijection $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} T_k^n(\rho')$ shows that $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+))$ is nothing more than what we called $W_k^n(\rho)$ in the previous sections.

Proposition 3.3.1. *Let's put on* $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+))$ *the direct limit bornology given by the filtrations, then we have the following isomorphism of bornological algebras*

$$\varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)).$$

Proof. The fastest way to get the isomorphism is to use the open mapping theorem for LF-spaces and use the LF-regularity of the LF-algebras that we showed in the previous section. Instead of taking this shortcut, we give an explicit isomorphism for the sake of aa better understanding the object that we are studying.

A subset

$$B \subset \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-))$$

is bounded if and only if it is bounded in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-))$ for some $\rho > r$. Moreover, as a topological k-algebra

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-)) = \varprojlim_{\rho'<\rho} (\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-)), \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)})$$

where $(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-)), \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)})$ denotes $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-))$ endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)} \doteq \sup_{x\in\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)} |f(x)|.$$

It's clear that if $\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+) \subset \mathbb{D}_k(\rho''^+)$ then

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)} \leqslant \|f\|_{\mathbb{D}_k(\rho''^+)},$$

hence the identity $(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-)), \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{D}_k(\rho''^+)}) \to (\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-)), \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)})$ is a bounded map. It's a classical result that this projective system gives the canonical Fréchet structure on $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^-))$.

So, by definition a subset $B \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho^+))$ is bounded if and only if it is bounded in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))$ for all $\rho' < \rho$. Hence B is bounded if and only if there exists $\rho' > \rho$ such that B is bounded in $D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+))$, which is precisely the property which characterize the bornology of

$$\varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)).$$

□

Proposition 3.3.2. *We have also the bornological identification*

$$\varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} T_k^n(\rho').$$

Proof. We can also deduce this proposition using the open mapping theorem for LF-spaces, but also in this case we like to have a better and explicit understanding of what are the objects we are dealing with. Since $D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+))$ is the completion of $T_k^n(\rho')$ with respect to the spectral norm, there exists a canonical bounded morphism $T_k^n(\rho') \hookrightarrow D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+))$. Now, it's clear that given any bounded subset $B \subset T_k^n(\rho') \subset \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} T_k^n(\rho')$ then this subset is bounded in $D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho')^+) \subset \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+))$. It is non-trivial to check the other implication which is equivalent to the existence of a canonical bounded map $D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)) \to T_k^n(\rho'')$ for any $\rho'' < \rho'$. One can easily reduce to the case $\rho' = 1$, so we have to check that for any $\rho < (1, \ldots, 1)$ there is a bounded map

$$D^n = D(\mathbb{D}_k((1, \ldots, 1^+))) \to T_k^n(\rho).$$

This is a classical consequence of Cauchy formula. Indeed, if $f \in D^n$ then one can write

$$f = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_i X^i$$

with

$$a_i = \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} f(z) \overline{z}^i dm(z)$$

where dm is the normalized Haar measure of the n-torus $\mathbb{T}^n$ (see for example [14]). To check that a map between Banach spaces is bounded it's enough to check that the unit ball of the domain space is mapped on a bounded subset of the codomain. So, the unit ball of D^n is composed by the elements such that

$$\|f\|_{\sup} = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}(D^n)} |f(x)| \leqslant 1$$

hence for this elements we have the estimate $|a_i| \leqslant 1$ for all i. So the series $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_i X^i$ is dominated by $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n} X^i$ and if if $\rho < (1, \ldots, 1)$

$$\|f\|_\rho \leqslant \| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n} X^i \|_\rho = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n} \rho^i < \infty.$$

Therefore the canonical injection $D^n \hookrightarrow T_k^n(\rho)$ is bounded. □

Remark 3.3.3. When we described the ring of overconvergent power-series we characterize its universal property by the identification

$$k\langle X \rangle^\dagger \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} k\langle \rho^{-1} X \rangle$$

and we noticed that the rings $k\langle\rho^{-1}X\rangle$ are not complete with respect to the spectral norm if k is archimedean, and that the universal property which characterize the completion of $k\langle\rho^{-1}X\rangle$ with respect to the spectral norm is (necessarily) different from that of $k\langle\rho^{-1}X\rangle$ itself. This mean that if k is archimedean there is no theory of affinoid algebras as one has in rigid geometry. Moreover, this fact is also emphasized by the very different behaviour of Banach algebras in the two different settings: archimedean Banach algebras always has non-closed ideals (if they are not division algebras), instead is one of the main foundational result of the theory of affinoid algebras that all the ideals are closed.

We saw in the previous section that W_k^n has all the good properties of Tate algebras (interpreted with the right language: one has to replace the concept of closed ideal with bornologically closed) and the previous proposition also shows that W_k^n allows to have a uniform theory also with respect to the characterization of power-series algebras with respect to universal properties: *i.e.* in any case we have only one algebra W_k^n with the same formal universal property. And it doesn't matter if we define it with the colimit $W_k^n = \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+))$ or $W_k^n = \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} T_k^n(\rho')$, the result is the same. What makes this working are precisely the bounded morphisms $D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^+)) \to T_k^n(\rho'')$ for any $\rho'' < \rho'$, that we described in the above proof.

This identifications of algebras imply also the identification of spectra

$$\mathcal{M}(W_k^n(\rho)) \cong \varprojlim \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho'^-))) \cong \frac{\mathbb{D}_{\overline{k}}(\rho^+)}{\mathrm{Gal}\,(\overline{k}/k)},$$

as a consequence of 2.5.13.

Theorem 3.3.4. *Let*

$$\phi : A = \frac{W_k^n}{(f_1, ..., f_r)} \to B = \frac{W_k^m}{(g_1, ..., g_s)}$$

be a morphism of k-dagger affinoid algebras. Then there exists ρ_A and ρ_B such that

$$A \cong \varinjlim_{1<\rho<\rho_A} \frac{D_k^n(\rho)}{\overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho}} = \varinjlim A_\rho$$

$$B \cong \varinjlim_{1<\rho<\rho_B} \frac{D_k^m(\rho)}{\overline{(g_1, ..., g_s)_\rho}} = \varinjlim B_\rho,$$

so for each $\rho \in \sqrt{k^\times}$ with $\rho < \rho_A$ and $\rho < \rho_B$ there exists a ρ' such that the canonical morphism

$$A_\rho \to A \to B$$

factorize through

$$B_{\rho'} \to B.$$

Proof. The isomorphisms proved in the previous propositions shows that all the arguments done in the previous section with the presentation $W_k^n \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} T_k^n(\rho)$ can be restated for the presentation $W_k^n \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} D(\mathbb{D}_k(\rho)^+)$. So, we can derive the claimed isomorphism and the required factorization with the same methods. □

Theorem 3.3.5. *Let*

$$\phi : A = \frac{W_k^n}{(f_1, ..., f_r)} \to B = \frac{W_k^m}{(g_1, ..., g_s)}$$

be a morphism of k-dagger algebras. Then there exists ρ_A and ρ_B such that

$$A \cong \varinjlim_{1<\rho<\rho_A} \frac{\mathcal{O}_k^n(\rho)}{(f_1,...,f_r)_\rho} = \varinjlim A_\rho$$

$$B \cong \varinjlim_{1<\rho<\rho_B} \frac{\mathcal{O}_k^m(\rho)}{(g_1,...,g_s)_\rho} = \varinjlim B_\rho,$$

so for each $\rho \in \sqrt{k^\times}$ with $\rho < \rho_A$ and $\rho < \rho_B$ there exists a ρ' such that the canonical morphism

$$A_\rho \to A \to B$$

factorize through

$$B_{\rho'} \to B.$$

Proof. The proof is always the same. We remark that we didn't need to take the closure of the ideals in $\mathcal{O}_k^n(\rho)$ because finitely generated ideals are closed for the Fréchet topology (and hence also bornologically closed), see [15] the "Closedness theorem" of page 169. □

Corollary 3.3.6. *If $k = \mathbb{C}$ then the category of $\mathbb{C}$-dagger affinoid algebras embeds fully faithfully in the category* **Ind**(**Stein**)*, where* **Stein** *denotes the category of Stein algebras.*

Proof. □

Remark 3.3.7. We already remarked that our closedness theorem for the ideals of dagger affinoid algebras is coherent with respect to classical result on affinoid algebras and on Stein algebras. Here we can underline that also the result on boundedness of any algebra morphism between dagger algebras is coherent not only with respect to the theory of affinoid algebras but also with the theory of Stein algebras: see page 185 of [15] (and the discussion in the preceding pages) where is shown that every algebra morphism between Stein algebras is continuous. Then, since Stein algebras are Fréchet, the boundedness of morphism is equivalent to continuity.

3.4 Dagger affinoid spaces

Let's start to study the dual category of the category of dagger affinoid algebras: the category of dagger affinoid spaces.

Definition 3.4.1. *The category of strict k-dagger affinoid spaces has as objects the topological spaces $\mathcal{M}(A)$, for A strict k-dagger affinoid algebra, and as morphisms the continuous maps which are duals of strict k-dagger algebra morphisms. The category of (non-strict) k-dagger affinoid spaces has as objects the topological spaces $\mathcal{M}(A)$, for A (non-strict) k-dagger affinoid algebras, and as morphisms the continuous maps which are duals of k-dagger algebra morphisms.*

We do not reserve particular symbols for the categories of affinoid dagger spaces, we denote them simply by $(\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger)^\circ$ and $(\mathbf{GAff}_k^\dagger)^\circ$.

As usual we use the spectra of the algebras that we are using as a mean to give a concrete representation of the objects of $(\mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger)^\circ$ and $(\mathbf{GAff}_k^\dagger)^\circ$. Let's see what is happening in the case of $\mathbb{C}$ (on $\mathbb{R}$ is the same by taking quotients by the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R})$). To do this we use the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^+)) = \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho'^-)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} T_k^n(\rho').$$

Each $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho'^{-}))$ is a Stein Algebra and from the theory of Stein Algebras we know that there is a homeomorphism

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{-}))) \cong \mathrm{Max}\,(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{-}))) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{-}),$$

where with $\mathrm{Max}\,(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{-})))$ we denote the set of finitely generated maximal ideals of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{-}))$. Hence get homeomorphisms

$$\mathcal{M}(W_k^n) \cong \mathrm{Max}\,(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{+}))) = \mathrm{Max}\,(\varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho'^{-}))) \cong \varprojlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathrm{Max}\,(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho'^{-}))) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{+}).$$

Next, by definition, any dagger affinoid algebra is a quotient of $W_k^n(\rho)$ by some ideal I which is finitely generated. Given a set of generators $f_1, ..., f_r \in I$ there exists a neighborhood of $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{+})$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$ where they define holomorphic functions. In the end of the previous section we saw that the dagger affinoid algebra $A = \frac{W_k^n}{I} = \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} A_{\rho'}$ can be seen as a direct limit of Stein algebras. Also, we have that $I_{\rho'} = I \cap \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho'^{-})) = \overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)}$, and it is known that for the Stein algebras all finitely generated ideals are closed, hence $\overline{(f_1, ..., f_r)} = (f_1, ..., f_r)$ in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho'^{-}))$.

Therefore in each open polydisk which contains the closed polydisk of radius ρ, we can identify the spectrum of $A_{\rho'}$ with the spectrum of quotient $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}((\rho')^{-}))/I_{\rho'}$ which is a Stein subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$ since it is the intersection of $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}((\rho')^{-})$ with the analytic set $\{x \in \mathbb{C}^n | f_1(x) = 0, ..., f_r(x) = 0\}$. Therefore

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \varprojlim_{\rho'>\rho} (A_{\rho'}) = \bigcap_{\rho>(1,...,1)} \mathcal{M}(A_{\rho'})$$

i.e.

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \{x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n || x_1| \leqslant \rho, ..., |x_n| \leqslant \rho, f_1(x) = 0, ..., f_r(x) = 0\}.$$

In the same vein, if k is non-archimedean it's known (see [33]) that $\mathrm{Max}\,(A) \cong \mathrm{Max}\,(A')$, where A' denote the completion of A with respect to the canonical norm, if A is strict. Since, canonically, $(W_k^n)' \cong T_k^n$ then A' is a classical affinoid algebra and so we get that

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \mathcal{M}(A') \cong \{x \in \mathcal{M}(W_k^n) | f_1(x) = 0, \ldots, f_r(x) = 0, f_i \in W_k^n\}.$$

In the same way, since any (non-strict) dagger affinoid algebra A can be presented as a colimit

$$A \cong \varinjlim_{\rho'>\rho} A_{\rho'}$$

with $A_{\rho'}$ strict dagger affinoid algebras, then

$$\mathcal{M}(A) \cong \varprojlim_{\rho'>\rho} \mathcal{M}(A_{\rho'}) \cong \{x \in \mathcal{M}(W_k^n(\rho)) | f_1(x) = 0, \ldots, f_r(x) = 0, f_i \in W_k^n(\rho)\}.$$

Proposition 3.4.2. *If k is non-archimedean then there is an equivalence*

$$(\mathbf{Aff}_k^{\dagger})^{\circ} \cong \mathbf{SGerms}_k$$

between the category of strict k-dagger affinoid spaces and the category of wide strict k-affinoid germs of analytic spaces of Berkovich and moreover the map which associate to a strict k-dagger affinoid space its corresponding analytic germ induces an homeomorphisms of underlying topological spaces.

Proof. The equivalence is valid by definition because Berkovich has shown that the category of strict wide analytic germs is antiequivalent to the category of strict k-dagger algebras, defined by Grosse-Klönne (see lemma 5.1.1, page 73, in [27]). But clearly our category of strict dagger algebras is equivalent to that of Grosse-Klonne if k is non-archimedean. Moreover two corresponding objects of the two categories have homeomorphic underlying topological spaces by construction, since the bornological spectrum of a k-dagger affinoid algebra is homeomorphic to the Berkovich spectrum of the associated k-affinoid algebra. In the sixth chapter we will equip $\mathcal{M}(A)$ of an analytic structure analogous to the one given by Berkovich. □

We can generalize the previous proposition in the following way.

Theorem 3.4.3. *Let k ba non-archimedean, then there is an equivalence*

$$(\mathbf{GAff}_k^{\dagger})^{\circ} \cong \mathbf{Germs}_k$$

between the category of k-dagger affinoid spaces and the category of wide k-affinoid germs of analytic spaces of Berkovich and moreover the map which associate to a k-dagger affinoid space its corresponding analytic germ induces an homeomorphisms of underlying topological spaces.

Proof. As already noted so far, any daggger affinoid algebra A can be presented as a direct limit

$$A \cong \varinjlim_{\rho' > \rho} A_{\rho'}$$

with $A_{\rho'}$ strict. With this fact and the previous proposition, the theorem follows easily. □

Proposition 3.4.4. *Let A be a dagger affinoid algebra over $\mathbb{C}$, then there is a bijection of sets*

$$\mathcal{M}(A) \cong \mathrm{Max}\,(A).$$

Proof. Let $|\cdot| \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. We know that $\mathrm{Ker}\,(|\cdot|)$ is a prime ideal of A and that we can extend the multiplicative seminorm $|\cdot|$ to

$$K = \frac{A}{\mathrm{Ker}\,(|\cdot|)}.$$

Then we can take the completion $\widehat{K}$ and this is a field complete with respect to an archimedean absolute value, hence $\widehat{K} \cong \mathbb{C}$. But this mean that we have a character $\chi : A \to \mathbb{C}$ and to give such a character is the same to give a system of characters $\chi_\rho : A_\rho \to \mathbb{C}$. Moreover each of the A_ρ are Stein algebras and $\mathcal{M}(A_\rho) \cong \mathrm{Max}\,(A_\rho)$ for Stein algebra, where we consider only finitely generated maximal ideals. Finally we have that

$$\mathrm{Max}\,(A) = \varprojlim \mathrm{Max}\,(A_\rho)$$

so each point of $\mathrm{Max}\,(A)$ is given by a system of characters. Hence the assertion. □

The same is true for $k = \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 3.4.5. We will see in the next chapters that the previous proposition has the nice consequence that we can easily adapt many of the proves of rigid geometry to the dagger archimedean case.

Proposition 3.4.6. *Every k-dagger affinoid space $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is locally arcwise connected.*

Proof. If k is non-archimedean this was shown by Berkovich in [28]. In the archimedean case we saw that $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is a filtered intersection of local analytic spaces which are well known to be locally arcwise connected. □

3.5 Dagger affinoid subdomains

Definition 3.5.1. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra. A closed subset $V \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ is called a* k-dagger affinoid subdomain *of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ if there exists a k-dagger affinoid algebra A_V and a morphism $\phi : A \to A_V$ such that $\mathcal{M}(\phi) : \mathcal{M}(A_V) \to \mathcal{M}(A)$ wuth $\mathrm{Im}\,(\mathcal{M}(\phi)) \subset V$ and for any given $\psi : A \to B$ with $\mathrm{Im}\,(\mathcal{M}(\psi)) \subset V$ there exists a unique bounded homomorphism $A_V \to B$ such that the following diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\phi} & A_V \\ & \searrow^{\psi} & \downarrow \\ & & B \end{array}$$

is commutative, for any K-dagger affinoid algebra B, where K/k is an extension of valued fields.

We say that $V \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ is a strict k-dagger affinoid subdomain *if the associated algebra A_V is a strict k-dagger algebra and the canonical map $\mathcal{M}(\phi) : \mathcal{M}(A_V) \to \mathcal{M}(A)$ is called a* dagger affinoid domain emedding.

Proposition 3.5.2. *Let $U \subset V \subset X$ be two inclusions of k-dagger affinoid subdomains, then U is a subdomain in X.*

Proof. By the universal property. □

Proposition 3.5.3. *Let $\phi : X = \mathcal{M}(A) \to Y = \mathcal{M}(B)$ be an affinoid map and $U \subset Y$ a k-dagger affinoid subdomain, then $\phi^{-1}(U)$ is a subdomain of X.*

Proof. Consider the following cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y \times_X U & \xrightarrow{p_1} & U \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle p_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i} \\ Y & \xrightarrow{\phi} & X \end{array}$$

then $\mathrm{Im}\,(p_2) \subset \phi^{-1}(U)$, by the definition of fibre product. Suppose now that $\psi : Z \to Y$ is another affinoid map such that $\mathrm{Im}\,(\psi) \subset \phi^{-1}(U)$ then this implies that $\mathrm{Im}\,(\phi \circ \psi) \subset U$ so $\phi \circ \psi : Z \to Y$ factors through U. This mean that there exists a unique map $\psi' : Z \to U$ which makes the triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & U \\ & \searrow^{\phi \circ \psi} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i} \\ & & Y \end{array}$$

commutative. Since we have maps $Z \to U$ and $Z \to Y$, by the universal property of $Y \times_X U$ there exists a unique map $\psi'' : Z \to Y \times_X U$ which makes the corresponding diagram commutative. Hence $\psi = p_2 \circ \psi'$, in a unique way so p_2 represent every map with $\mathrm{Im}\,(\psi) \subset \phi^{-1}(U)$ therefore $\phi^{-1}(U)$ is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain of B, whose associated algebra is $B \otimes^{\dagger}_{A} A_U$. □

Corollary 3.5.4. *Let $U, V \subset X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be two k-dagger affinoid subdomains of X then $U \cap V$ is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain of X.*

Proof. Particular case of the previous proposition. □

Proposition 3.5.5. *Let A be a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra and $\phi : \mathcal{M}(A_U) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}(A)$ a strict k-dagger affinoid algebras morphism representing all morphism into $U \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$, then*

1. *ϕ is injective and satisfies $\phi(\mathcal{M}(A_U)) = U$;*
2. *for any $x \in \mathrm{Max}\,(A_U)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\phi^* : A \to A_U$ induces an isomorphism*
$$\frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}^n_{\phi(x)}} \to \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}^n_x};$$
3. *for any $x \in \mathrm{Max}\,(A_U)$, $\mathfrak{m}_x = \phi^*(\mathfrak{m}_{\phi(x)})A_U$.*

Proof. The proof is the same of [26] proposition 7.2.2/1. We write here the full proof for the sake of completeness. Let $y \in U$ and consider for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the following diagram



where π and π_U are the canonical morphisms and σ is induced by ϕ^*. Since ϕ represent all the dagger affinoid maps into U there exists a unique map $\alpha : A_U \to \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}^n_y}$ making the upper triangle commutative. Then both the maps π_U and $\sigma \circ \alpha$ make the diagram



commutative. Therefore for the universal property of A_U, $\pi_U = \sigma \circ \alpha$, which implies that also the lower triangle of the above diagram commutes. This commutativity relation easily imply that σ and α are surjective and also

$$\mathrm{Ker}\,(\pi_U) = \phi^*(\mathfrak{m}^n_y)A_U \subset \mathrm{Ker}\,\alpha$$

so σ is bijective. Taking $n = 1$ we see that $\phi^*(\mathfrak{m}_y)A_U$ is a maximal ideal, showing the injectivity of ϕ on the subset $\mathrm{Max}\,(U) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Max}\,(A)$ which settles the archimedean case and the non-archimedean case follows from [28] proposition 2.1.15. □

Corollary 3.5.6. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra and $\phi : \mathcal{M}(A_U) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}(A)$ a k-dagger affinoid algebras morphism representing all morphism into $U \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$, then $\mathcal{M}(A_U) \cong U$.*

Proof. □

Let A be a k-dagger algebra and $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ it's spectrum. We use the following notations for $f = (f_1, ..., f_n) \in A^n$ and $g = (g_1, ..., g_m) \in A^m$, $h \in A$

$$X(f_1, ..., f_n) = X(f) = \{x \in X || f_i(x)| \leqslant 1\}$$

$$X(f_1, ..., f_n, g_1^{-1}, ..., g_m^{-1}) = X(f, g^{-1}) = \{x \in X || f_i(x)| \leqslant 1, |g_j(x)| \geqslant 1\}$$

and if $f_1, ..., f_n, h$ don't have any common zero

$$X(\frac{f_1}{h}, ..., \frac{f_n}{h}) = X(\frac{f}{h}) = \left\{x \in X | \frac{|f_i(x)|}{|h(x)|} \leqslant 1\right\}$$

Proposition 3.5.7. *Let A be a k-dagger algebra and $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ it's spectrum then*

1. *for any $f_1, .., f_n \in A$, $X(f_1, ..., f_n)$ is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain of X, called Weierstrass subdomain;*
2. *for any $f_1, .., f_n, g_1, ..., g_m \in A$, $X(f_1, ..., f_n, g_1^{-1}, ..., g_m^{-1})$ is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain of X, called Laurent subdomain;*
3. *for any $f_1, .., f_n, g \in A$, $X(\frac{f}{g})$ is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain of X, called rational subdomain.*

Proof. 1. Let $\phi : A \to B$ be an affinoid map for which $\phi^* : \mathcal{M}(B) \to \mathcal{M}(A)$ is such that $\mathrm{Im}\,(\phi^*) \subset X(f_1, ..., f_n)$. This mean that for all $x \in \mathcal{M}(B)$

$$|\phi(f_i)(x)| \leqslant 1$$

so $\phi(f_i) \in B^\circ$. Then by the universal property of $A\langle f\rangle^\dagger$ we have a unique map

$$A \to A\langle f\rangle^\dagger$$

which represent all dagger affinoid maps with image contained in $X(f_1, ..., f_n)$. So, the association $X(f) \mapsto A\langle f\rangle^\dagger$ gives the required k-dagger affinoid subdomain.

2. By the same reasoning on the universal property of $A\langle f, g^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$.
3. By the universal property of $A\langle \frac{f}{g}\rangle^\dagger$.

□

Proposition 3.5.8. *Let A be a k-dagger algebra and $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ it's spectrum;*

1. *let $U, V \subset X$ be subdomains, then if they are both Weierstrass then $U \cap V$ is Weierstrass. The same for Laurent and rational;*
2. *every Weierstrass subdomain is a Laurent subdomain and any Laurent subdomain is a rational subdomain;*
3. *let $\phi : X \to Y$ be an affinoid map and $U \subset Y$ an affinoid subdomain, then if U is Weierstrass (resp. Laurent or rational) then $\phi^{-1}(U)$ is Weierstrass (resp. Laurent or rational);*

Proof. We use the same reasoning of [26], 7.2.3/7, 7.2.3/8 and 7.2.3/6.

1. The case of Weierstrass and Laurent need no proof. Let

$$U = X(\frac{f_1}{h}, ..., \frac{f_n}{h})$$

$$V = X(\frac{g_1}{l}, ..., \frac{g_m}{l})$$

then $(f_1, ..., f_n, h) = A$ and $(g_1, ..., g_m, l) = A$ and also the products $f_i g_j, f_i l, g_j l, hl$ generates the unit ideal. So

$$Y = X(\frac{f_1 g_1}{hl}, ..., \frac{f_n g_m}{hl})$$

is a well defined rational subdomain of X. We have that $U \cap V \subset Y$ since if $x \in U \cap V$ then

$$|f_i(x)| \leqslant |h(x)|, |g_j(x)| \leqslant |l(x)|$$

for all i, j, so by the multiplicativity of $|\cdot|$ we have that for all i and j

$$|(f_i g_j)(x)| \leqslant |(hl)(x)|.$$

For the other inclusion, let $x \in Y$ then it satisfies the relation

$$|f_i(x)||l(x)| \leqslant |h(x)||l(x)|$$

for all i. Since $|h(x)||l(x)| \neq 0$, otherwise there is a common zero between the functions defining Y, one can cancel $l(x)$ from the above relation obtaining

$$|f_i(x)| \leqslant |h(x)|.$$

The same can be done for g_j and h proving the claim.

2. Any Weierstrass is Laurent by definition. And by the previous point we see that for any Laurent we have the relation

$$X(f_1, ..., f_n, g_1^{-1}, ..., g_m^{-1}) = X(\frac{f_1}{1}) \cap ... \cap X(\frac{1}{g_m})$$

which are rational subdomains.

3. Let $U = Y(f_1, ..., f_n)$ be a Weierstrass subdomain of Y. We have that to $\phi : X \to Y$ correspond a dagger affinoid map $\phi^* : A_Y \to A_X$ of dagger affinoid algebras. So we have that

$$\phi^{-1}(Y(f_1, ..., f_n)) = \{x \in X || \phi(f_i)(x)| \leqslant 1\} = X(\phi^*(f_1), ..., \phi^*(f_n)).$$

The same argument can be given for Laurent and rational subdomains.

□

Chapter 4

Tate's acyclicity for rational dagger subdomains

In this section we use the notation $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ to denote the k-dagger algebra of a k-dagger subdomain $U \subset X$ of a k-dagger affinoid space $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$.

Definition 4.0.9. *We say that a family of subdomains $U_i \subset X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ is a* dagger affinoid covering *if $\bigcup U_i = X$.*

By the properties of the subdomains of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ it's clear that the family of finite affinoid coverings give to $\mathcal{M}(A)$ the structure of a G-topological space. Moreover, the association $U \mapsto \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ is a presheaf for this G-topology. In this section we will check that this presheaf is a sheaf. To do this we use the same reduction to Laurent coverings argument as classical Tate proof that can be found for example in [26], section 8.2. So we need some lemmas.

Lemma 4.0.10. *Let $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ and $X = \bigcup U_i$ a strict dagger affinoid covering, then $\mathcal{O}_X(X) \to \prod \mathcal{O}_X(U_i)$ is injective.*

Proof. We can prove this lemma reasoning in the same way of proposition 7.3.2/3 of [26], but it's quite long. To shorten the arguments we note that the non-archimedean case is already known and the archimedean case follows from 5.1.4 (where we prove that in fact the algebras $\mathcal{O}_X(U_i)$ coincides with the algebras of analytic functions on U_i given by the immersion $\mathcal{M}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$). It's easy to check that there are no circular arguments in this forward reference. □

Lemma 4.0.11. *Let A be a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra, then for any $f \in A$ there exist a point $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ such that*

$$|f(x)| = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}(A)} |f_i(x)|.$$

Proof. We already showed that the spectral norm is well defined, see definition 2.1.31. □

Lemma 4.0.12. *Let $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ with A a strict k-dagger algebra and $f_1, ..., f_n \in A$, then the function*

$$\alpha(x) \doteq \max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} |f(x)|$$

assume it's minimum in X.

Proof. The proof is identical to [26] lemma 7.3.4/7. If the f_i's have a common zero then there is nothing to show. Otherwise they generate the unit ideal in A, and consider the covering of X given by

$$X_i = X\left(\frac{f_1}{f_i}, ..., \frac{f_r}{f_i}\right) = \{x \in X | \alpha(x) = |f_i(x)|\}.$$

By previous lemma $|f_i(x)|$ assume its minimum on X_i (because it is the maximum of f_i^{-1}) and so α assume its minimum in X which it the least of the minimum of the f_i over the X_i. □

Definition 4.0.13. *Let A be a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra, $f_1, ..., f_n \in A$ and $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$. Then each*

$$\mathscr{U}_i = \left\{X(f_i), X(f_i^{-1})\right\}$$

is a k-dagger affinoid covering of X. We denote by $\mathscr{U}_1 \times ... \times \mathscr{U}_n$ the covering consisting of all the intersections of the form $U_1 \cap ... \cap U_n$ where $U_i \in \mathscr{U}_i$. We call this the Laurent covering of X generated by $f_1, ..., f_n$.

More explicitly the elements of the Laurent covering generated by $f_1, ..., f_n$ are subdomains of the form

$$X(f_1^{\mu_1}, ..., f_n^{\mu_n})$$

with $\mu_i = \pm 1$.

Definition 4.0.14. *Let A be a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra, $f_1, ..., f_n \in A$ with no common zeros and $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$. Then*

$$\mathscr{U} \doteq \left\{X\left(\frac{f_1}{f_i}, ..., \frac{f_n}{f_i}\right)\right\}_{i=1,...,n}$$

is a k-dagger affinoid covering called the rational covering of X generated by $f_1, ..., f_n$.

We call the G-topology on X induced by finite covering by strict rational domains the rational G-topology on X.

Lemma 4.0.15. *Let $\mathscr{U}$ be a strict rational covering of X, then there exists a strict Laurent covering $\mathscr{V}$ of X such that for any $V \in \mathscr{V}$ the covering $\mathscr{U}|_V$ is a strict rational covering of V, which is generated by units in $\mathcal{O}_X(V)$.*

Proof. The proof is identical to [26] lemma 8.2.2/3. Let $f_1, ..., f_n \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ be the elements which generate the rational covering $\mathscr{U}$. Choose a constant $c \in k^\times$ such that

$$|c|^{-1} < \inf_{x \in X}(\max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} |f_i(x)|)$$

which is well defined by previous lemma.

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the Laurent covering generated by $cf_1, ..., cf_n$. Consider a set

$$V = X((cf_1)^{\alpha_1}, ..., (cf_n)^{\alpha_n}) \in \mathscr{V}$$

where $\alpha_i = \pm 1$. We can assume that there exists an $s \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}$ such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_s = 1$ and $\alpha_{s+1} = ... = \alpha_n = -1$. Then

$$X(\frac{f_1}{f_i}, ..., \frac{f_n}{f_i}) \cap V = \varnothing$$

for $i = 1, ..., s$ since

$$\max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant s} |f_i(x)| \leqslant |c|^{-1} < \max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} |f_i(x)|$$

for all $x \in V$. In particular for all $x \in V$

$$\max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} |f_i(x)| = \max_{s+1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} |f_i(x)|$$

hence $\mathscr{U}|_V$ is the rational covering of V generated by $f_i|_V$ for $s+1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, which are units in V. □

Lemma 4.0.16. *Let $\mathscr{U}$ be a strict rational covering of X which is generated by units in $f_1, ..., f_n \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ then there exists a strict Laurent covering $\mathscr{V}$ of X which is a refinement of $\mathscr{U}$.*

Proof. Yet identical to [26] lemma 8.2.2/4. Let's take as $\mathscr{V}$ the Laurent covering generated by all the products $f_i f_j^{-1}$ with $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n$. Consider $V \in \mathscr{V}$. Defining $I = \{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 | 1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n\}$, so we can find a partition $I_1 \coprod I_2 = I$ such that

$$V = \bigcap_{(i,j) \in I_1} X(f_i f_j^{-1}) \cap \bigcap_{(i,j) \in I_2} X(f_j f_i^{-1}).$$

We define a partial order on $\{1, ..., n\}$ requiring that if $(i,j) \in I_1$ then $i \tilde{<} j$ or if $(i,j) \in I_2$ then $j \tilde{<} i$. For each $i, j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ with $i \neq j$ then $i \tilde{<} j$ or $j \tilde{<} i$. Consider a maximal chain (which always exists) $i_1 \tilde{<} ... \tilde{<} i_r$ of elements of $\{1, ..., n\}$. Since i_r is maximal we have that for any $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ $i \tilde{<} i_r$ which implies $|f_i(x)| \leqslant |f_j(x)|$ for all $x \in V$, *i.e.*

$$V \subset X\left(\frac{f_1}{f_{i_r}}, ..., \frac{f_n}{f_{i_r}}\right).$$

□

Proposition 4.0.17. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a presheaf for the rational G-topology of $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$. If the strict Laurent coverings are acyclic then all strict rational coverings are acyclic.*

Proof. By the previous lemma on refinements. □

Theorem 4.0.18. *The presheaf $\mathcal{O}_X$ is acyclic for the rational G-topology.*

Proof. By previous lemmas we can reduce to the case of strict Laurent coverings and then by induction to the case of the covering $\mathscr{U} = \{X(f), X(f^{-1})\}$ with $f \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$. So writing $\mathcal{O}_X(X) = A$ we have to verify that

$$0 \to A \xrightarrow{\alpha} A\langle f \rangle^\dagger \times A\langle f^{-1} \rangle^\dagger \xrightarrow{\beta} A\langle f, f^{-1} \rangle^\dagger \to 0$$

is an exact sequence, where α is the canonical injection and where we have identified $A\langle f, f^{-1} \rangle^\dagger = \mathcal{O}_X(X(f, f^{-1}))$ with the module of alternating cochains and $\beta(f_1, f_2) = f_1 - f_2$.

We can construct the following commutative diagram:



where X and Y are variables, α and β are as above, i is the canonical injection, $\delta(h_1(X), h_2(Y)) = h_1(X) - h_2(X^{-1})$ and γ is induced by δ since $(X-f)A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \times (1-fY)A\langle Y\rangle^\dagger \subset A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \times A\langle Y\rangle^\dagger$ and if $(h_1(X), h_2(Y)) \in (X-f)A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \times (1-fY)A\langle Y\rangle^\dagger$ then $\delta(h_1(X), h_2(Y)) \in (X-f)A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ because in this case

$$h_1(X) = (X-f)r_1(X), h_2(X) = (1-fY)r_2(Y)$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(X) - h_2(X^{-1}) &= (X-f)r_1(X) - (1-fX^{-1})r_2(X^{-1}) = \\ &= (X-f)r_1(X) - XX^{-1}(1-fX^{-1})r_2(X^{-1}) = \\ &= (X-f)r_1(X) - X(X-f)r_2(X^{-1}) \in (X-f)A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

The vertical maps are characterized by $X \mapsto f$ and $Y \mapsto f^{-1}$. The first column is exact by the definition of $A\langle f\rangle^\dagger$ and of $A\langle f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. Now consider the second column: by definition

$$A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger = \frac{A\langle X, Y\rangle^\dagger}{(X-f, 1-fY)}$$

and

$$A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger = \frac{A\langle X, Y\rangle^\dagger}{(1-XY)}.$$

Now consider the canonical map induced by $X \mapsto f$ from $A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ to $A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. This is surjective and clearly its kernel is given by $(X-f)A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$. Hence also the second column is exact.

Now let's consider the rows. We have that as an A-module

$$A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \cong A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \oplus X^{-1}A\langle X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$$

and so

$$(X-f)A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger = (X-f)A\langle X\rangle^\dagger + (1-fX^{-1})A\langle X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$$

hence $(X-f)A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \times (1-fX^{-1})A\langle X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to (X-f)A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ is surjective, and consequently also $A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \times A\langle Y\rangle^\dagger \to A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ is surjective. So the first row is exact and for the second row suppose that

$$\delta(h_1(X), h_2(Y)) = 0$$

then

$$h_1(X) - h_2(X^{-1}) = 0.$$

But h_1 is a power-series in X and h_2 in X^{-1} so the last equation implies that all coefficients of the series must be zero but the one on degree 0. So h_1 and h_2 must be constant and hence the second row is exact.

Moreover, injectivity of α follows from lemma 4.0.10 and with this we can prove that the third row is exact by diagram chasing: so let's take $h \in A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$, we can find $h' \in A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ and an $h'' \in A\langle X, Y\rangle^\dagger$ such that $\delta(h'') = h'$ by the surjectivity of δ just showed. Therefore, by the commutation of the last square the image of h'' in $A\langle f\rangle^\dagger \times A\langle f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ gives an element whose image under β is equal to h hence β is surjective. Finally, by the definition of β we have that $\mathrm{Im}\,(\alpha) \subset \mathrm{Ker}\,(\beta)$ and if $h \in \mathrm{Ker}\,(\beta)$ then $\beta(h) = 0$, so

$$\xi^{-1}(\beta(h)) = (X - f)A\langle X, X^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$$

$$\delta^{-1}(\xi^{-1}(\beta(h))) = A + (X - f)A\langle X\rangle^\dagger \times (1 - fY)A\langle Y\rangle^\dagger$$

therefore

$$\zeta(\delta^{-1}(\xi^{-1}(\beta(h)))) = A = \mathrm{Im}\,(\alpha).$$

This proves the theorem. □

Remark 4.0.19. The non-archimedean case was already pointed out by Grosse-Klönne in [33]. In this section we saw that our machinary developed until here permit us to replying the same reasoning done in rigid geometry also in the archimedean case.

Chapter 5

The Gerritzen-Grauert theorem

5.1 Archimedean subdomains

In this section we study the dagger affinoid subdomains when k is an archimedean complete valued field. We see that this case has particular features which are very different from the non-archimedean case.

Definition 5.1.1. *We say that a k-dagger affinoid subdomain $U \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ is* roomy *if has non-empty topological interior with respect to the weak topology of $\mathcal{M}(A)$.*

If k is non-archimedean then it is well known that every strict k-dagger subdomain is roomy. If k is archimedean this is not always the case.

Example 5.1.2. Take for example $f_1 = 2z_1, ..., f_n = 2z_n \in W_k^n$, with k archimedean. Then

$$\mathcal{M}(W_k^n\langle f_1, ..., f_n\rangle^\dagger) = \{x \in \mathbb{D}_k((1, ..., 1)^+)||f_1| \leqslant 1, ..., |f_n| \leqslant 1\} =$$

$$= \{x \in \mathbb{D}_k((1, ..., 1)^+)||z_1| \leqslant \frac{1}{2}, ..., |z_n| \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{M}(W_k^n\langle f_1^{-1}, ..., f_n^{-1}\rangle^\dagger) = \{x \in \mathbb{D}_k((1, ..., 1)^+)||f_1| \geqslant 1, ..., |f_n| \geqslant 1\} =$$

$$= \{x \in \mathbb{D}_k((1, ..., 1)^+)||z_1| \geqslant \frac{1}{2}, ..., |z_n| \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\}$$

hence

$$\mathcal{M}(W_k^n\langle f_1, ..., f_n\rangle^\dagger) \cap \mathcal{M}(W_k^n\langle f_1^{-1}, ..., f_n^{-1}\rangle^\dagger) = \{x \in \mathbb{D}_k((1, ..., 1)^+)||z_1| = \frac{1}{2}, ..., |z_n| = \frac{1}{2}\}$$

which has empty topological interior.

Definition 5.1.3. *Let X be a k-dagger affinoid space and $U \subset X$ a k-dagger affinoid subdomain. We say that U is* Stein *in the following case: for every U if k is non-archimedean and if U is a compact Stein subset of X if $k = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$.*

If $k = \mathbb{C}$, then we saw that for any dagger affinoid algebra we have a natural embedding $\mathcal{M}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ for a suitable n. This gives to $\mathcal{M}(A)$ a natural analytic structure, or better a pro-analytic structure (see appendix A) thinking of $\mathcal{M}(A) = \varprojlim_{\rho > 1} \mathcal{M}(A_\rho)$ for the Stein algebras

A_ρ. For any pro-open $U \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ we denote $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathcal{M}(A)}(U)$ the sections of the structural sheaf obtained in this way on $\mathcal{M}(A)$. Explicitly, for any for any object $U \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{ProSite}(\mathcal{M}(A)))$

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathcal{M}(A)}(U) = \varinjlim_{V \supset U} \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathcal{M}(A)}(V)$$

where V range over all open neighborhood of U.

Theorem 5.1.4. *Let $U \subset X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be a k-dagger rational subdomain of X, then*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_X(U) \cong A_U$$

as algebras.

Proof. Let $U = X\left(\frac{f}{g}\right)$. It is easy to show that there is an homeomorphism of U with the set

$$Y = \mathcal{M}(A\langle\frac{f}{g}\rangle^\dagger) = \{(x,y) \in \mathcal{M}(A) \times \mathcal{M}(W_k^n) | g(x)y_1 - f_1(x) = 0, ..., g(x)y_n - f_n(x) = 0\}.$$

Let's write $\pi : Y \to X$ for the canonical projection. π is an analytic map and so we have the induced map

$$\pi^* : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_X(U) \to \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_Y(Y) \cong A\langle\frac{f}{g}\rangle^\dagger.$$

π^* is injective because π is a homeomorphism. Moreover, the $\frac{f_i}{g}$ define holomorphic functions on U and $\pi^*\left(\frac{f_i}{g}\right) = y_i \in \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_Y(Y)$. Finally, given any

$$\sum_{j,l} a_j x^j b_l y^l \in \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_Y(Y)$$

the corresponding series

$$\sum_{j,l} a_j x^j b_l \left(\frac{f}{g}\right)^l \in \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_X(U)$$

define an overconvergent analytic function on U because the coefficients a_i and b_j are summable for x in a neighborhood of U and $|\frac{f_i(x)}{g_j(x)}| \leqslant 1$ on U, hence they give raise to a well defined analytic function on U. □

Corollary 5.1.5. *Let $U \subset X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be a k-dagger rational subdomain of X, then U is a compact Stein subset of X.*

Proof. $\mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong A\langle\frac{f}{g}\rangle^\dagger$ is an **Ind**-Stein algebra. □

Corollary 5.1.6. *Let $U \subset X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be a k-dagger rational subdomain of X, then*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_X(U) \cong A_U$$

as bornological algebras.

Proof. By LF-regularity of both algebras we can reduce to check that they are isomorphic as LF-algebras. Since they are isomorphic as algebras it is enough to show that there exist a continuous bijective map $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_X(U) \to A_U$, and use the open mapping theorem. It's easy to check that the bijection studied in the previous theorem is continuous. □

Remark 5.1.7. We remark that the previous theorem implies in particular that the k-dagger rational subdomains are inverse limit of domain of holomorphy, *i.e.* that the domains of the form

$$U_\rho = \{x \in \mathcal{M}(A) | \frac{|f_1(z)|}{|g(z)|} < \rho, \ldots, \frac{|f_n(z)|}{|g(z)|} < \rho\}, \rho > 1$$

are domain of homolomorphy. This can be seen explicitly by exhibiting a holomorphic function on U_ρ which is singular on any point of the border of U_ρ. We can take $\rho = 1$ and consider the function

$$h_{i,\theta}(z) = \frac{1}{g(z)e^{\mathrm{i}\theta} - f_i(z)}$$

which is holomorphic inside U_1. Varying i and θ we can find such family of functions.

Hence we can avoid to use different symbols for $\mathcal{O}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ for the sections of our presheaves and use always $\mathcal{O}$.

Definition 5.1.8. *We say that a k-dagger affinoid subdomain $U \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ is* good *in the following cases: if k is non-archimedean, and if k is archimedean if $\mathcal{O}_X(V) \cong A_V$.*

Corollary 5.1.9. *Any $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ admits a neighborhood basis for the weak topology made of good roomy k-dagger subdomains .*

Proof. Weierstrass roomy subdomains with x as interior point are a basis of neighborhoods for the weak topology of any point of $\mathcal{M}(A)$. □

Definition 5.1.10. *Let A be a dagger algebra and $\phi : B \to C$ be a morphism of dagger algebras which are A-algebras. ϕ is called* inner with respect to A *if there exists an epimorphism $\pi : A\langle r_1^{-1}T_1, \ldots, r_n^{-1}T_n\rangle^\dagger \to B$ such that*

$$\rho_C(\phi(\pi(T_i))) < r_i$$

for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$.

Definition 5.1.11. *Let $\phi : \mathcal{M}(A) = X \to \mathcal{M}(B) = Y$ be a morphism of k-dagger affinoid spaces. The* relative interior of ϕ *is the set*

$$\mathrm{Int}\,(X/Y) \doteq \{x \in X | A \to \mathcal{H}(x) \text{ is inner w.r.t. } B\}.$$

The complement of $\mathrm{Int}\,(X/Y)$ *is called the* relative boundary of ϕ *and denoted by $\partial(X/Y)$. If $A = k$, the sets* $\mathrm{Int}\,(X/Y)$ *and $\partial(X/Y)$ are denoted by* $\mathrm{Int}\,(X)$ *and $\partial(Y)$ and called the* interior *and the* boundary *of X.*

Definition 5.1.12. *Let $G \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ be an open subset. We say that G is* good *if G admits an exhaustion by good subdomains,* i.e. *if there exists a sequence of good sudomains $U_i \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ such that $U_i \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(U_{i+1})$ and*

$$\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} U_i = G.$$

Corollary 5.1.13. *Any $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ admits a basis for the weak topology made of good open subsets .*

Proof. □

Definition 5.1.14. *Let $G \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ be an open subset. We say that G is* principal *if G admits an exhaustion by subdomains,* i.e. *if there exists a sequence of sudomains $U_i \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ such that $U_i \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(U_{i+1})$ and*

$$\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} U_i = G.$$

Hence for any principal open subset we can associate the algebra

$$\mathcal{O}_X(G) = A_G \doteq \varprojlim A_{U_i}.$$

Proposition 5.1.15. *Let $G \subset \mathcal{M}(A) = X$ be a good open subset, then*

1. *if $G \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(X)$ then the algebra A_G can be equipped canonically with a structure of Fréchet algebra;*
2. *if $k = \mathbb{C}$ and U_i are Stein subdomains and $G \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(X)$ then A_G is a Stein algebra;*
3. *there exists a homeomorphism $G \cong \mathcal{M}(G)$;*
4. *the space $\mathcal{M}(G)$ doesn't depend on the choice of the exhaustion;*
5. *if $k = \mathbb{C}$ and $G \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(X)$ the homeomorphism $G \cong \mathcal{M}(G)$ extends to an isomorphism of Stein spaces $(G, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}(A)}(G)) \cong (\mathcal{M}(G), A_G)$.*

Proof. 1. Let $\{U_i\}$ be an exhaustion of G. Then there is a canonical sequence of maps

$$\cdots \to A_{i+1} \to A_i \to A_{i-1} \to \cdots$$

given by the subdomain embedding $U_i \hookrightarrow U_{i+1}$ (these maps are subdomain embedding because the preimage of a subdomain by a dagger affinoid map is a subdomain). The A_i are dagger affinoid algebras, hence we can write $A_i = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} A_i^\rho$ and we get a presentation

$$A_G = \varprojlim_{i\in I} \varinjlim_{\rho>1} A_i^\rho.$$

The relation

$$\bigcup U_i = G$$

implies that the U_i must be roomy, at least for a final part of the limit (because I is countable). So we can suppose that all the U_i are roomy. By the identity theorem we deduce that the canonical maps of dagger affinoid algebras are injective and so the projective limit becomes

$$A_G = \bigcap_{i\in I} A_i$$

and the double limit becomes

$$A_G = \bigcap_{i\in I} \bigcup_{\rho>1} A_i^\rho$$

set-theoretically. Also, the condition $U_i \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(U_{i+1})$ implies that for any i there exists a $\rho_i > 1$ such that $A_i^\rho \supset A_{i+1}$ so, set-theoretically

$$A_G = \bigcap_{i\in I} A_i^{\rho_i} = \varprojlim_{i\in I} A_i^{\rho_i}.$$

So we can write A_G as a projective limit of complete normed algebra we need to show that this limit, calculated in the category of bornological algebras gives to A_G the structure of a Fréchet algebra. So, we have the isomorphism

$$A_G^t \cong \varprojlim_{i\in I} \left(A_i^{\rho_i}\right)^t.$$

On the right side we have a Fréchet algebra, since we are calculating a projective limit, in the category of locally convex spaces, of a countable family of complete normes spaces, the result is a complete metrizable locally convex topological vector space. Then, this space is known to be normal, so its topology coincides with the locally convex topology given by the bornivorous subset with respect to the family of bounded subset given by the limit

$$\varprojlim_{i\in I} A_i^{\rho_i}$$

calculated in the category of bornological vector space of convex type. But this is precisely the definition of A_G^t, so A_G^t is canonically a Fréchet algebra.

2. In the case $k = \mathbb{C}$ we can see that G is a Stein because

$$G = \bigcup_{i\in I} U_i = \bigcup_{i\in I} \mathrm{Int}\,(U_i)$$

and each $\mathrm{Int}\,(U_i)$ is a Stein subset, and it's known that the union of a filtrant family of Stein subsets is a Stein subset. Finally, since U_i are good subdomains then the condition $G \subset \mathring{X}$ ensure that G is homeomorphic to a union of open sets of $\mathbb{C}^n$, for some n, and

$$A_G \cong \mathcal{O}_X(G)$$

and the Fréchet structure given above to it is equivalent to the usual Fréchet structure of algebras of holomorphic functions. Hence A_G is a Stein algebra by construction.

3. We notice that the limit

$$A_G^t \cong \varprojlim_{i\in I} (A_i^{\rho_i})^t$$

satisfies the condition of theorem 2.5.7 hence

$$\mathcal{M}(A_G^t) \cong \bigcup_{i\in I} \mathcal{M}(A_i^t) \cong \bigcup_{i\in I} U_i = G.$$

Moreover, as we already remarked previously, in this case we also have the homeomorphism

$$\mathcal{M}(A_G) \cong \mathcal{M}(A_G^t)$$

where on A_G we impose the bornology induced by the Fréchet structure.

4. A_G is a Fréchet algebra.

5. Well known by the theory of Stein algebras.

□

Example 5.1.16. The main examples of good open subsets are given by open subsets exhausted by rational subdomains. We can see it with a simple example, in the disk $X = \mathcal{M}(W_k^1)$ we can consider

$$G = \{x \in X || x| < \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

G is simply a smaller polydisk and is exhausted by the family of subdomains

$$U_i = \{x \in X || x| \leqslant \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{i}\}, i \in \mathbb{N}, i > 1.$$

It's clear that if $k = \mathbb{C}$

$$\varprojlim A_{U_i} = \mathcal{O}_X(G)$$

the usual set of analytic functions on G.

We can give now another proof of Tate's acyclicity for rational coverings, with k archimedean, exploiting the isomorphism given in 5.1.4.

Theorem 5.1.17. *(Tate acyciclity for k archimedean)*
Let $\mathcal{M}(A) = X$ be a dagger affinoid space over $\mathbb{C}$ and consider on it the G-topology given by finite coverings by rational subdomains. Then, the presheaf $U \mapsto A_U$ is acyclic.

Proof. Let's consider covering of X, $\{U_1, ..., U_n\}$, made by rational k-dagger subdomains. We can suppose that each U_i is roomy, otherwise it has zero measure and is necessarily contained in some other (roomy) element of the covers. We saw that X is a pro-Stein space that can be presented with the formula

$$X = \bigcap_{\rho>1} X^\rho$$

where X^ρ are Stein spaces. By theorem 5.1.4 we know that $A_{U_i} \cong \mathcal{O}_X(U_i)$, where $\mathcal{O}_X$ is the canonical sheaf of the pro-analytic site of X, and so there exist a sequence of open subspaces $U_i^\rho \subset X^\rho$ such that

$$U_i = \bigcap_{\rho>1} U_i^\rho$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_X(U_i) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \mathcal{O}_{X^\rho}(U_i^\rho).$$

Moreover, since U_i is a compact Stein we can always find a basis of open neighborhood of U_i made of open Stein subsets. So, we can always suppose that all U_i^ρ are open Stein subsets of X^ρ. Since the U_i cover X we can find a ρ such that for any $\rho' < \rho$ the $U_i^{\rho'}$ covers $X^{\rho'}$, hence we get that the Cech complex

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{X^{\rho'}} \to \prod_i \mathcal{O}_{U_i^{\rho'}} \to \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{O}_{U_i^{\rho'} \cap U_j^{\rho'}} \to \cdots$$

is acyclic for $\rho' < \rho$. Taking the direct limit on the ρ we get the diagram

$$0 \to \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \mathcal{O}_{X^\rho} \to \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \prod_i \mathcal{O}_{U_i^\rho} \to \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{O}_{U_i^\rho \cap U_j^\rho} \to \cdots$$

because the $\rho' < \rho$ are final for the diagram in question. But $\varinjlim$ is an exact functor, hence the last complex is also acyclic. □

Remark 5.1.18. The analogy between compact Stein subsets of a complex analytic space and affinoid subdomains of rigid analytic space was suggested by Brian Conrad in [34]. We can see more formally the idea of Conrad in the following way. If X is a complex analytic space we can define a site X_s, which we can call the *compact Stein site* of X, whose objects are the compact Stein subsets of X and the coverings are the locally finite coverings. By the properties characterizing the compact Stein subsets of an analytic space its easy to deduce that this site is well defined and that the Cech cohomology of X_s coincides with the usual sheaf cohomology of X.

The same reasoning can be done on $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ which is itself a compact Stein subset of X and can be thought as a pro-analytic space. And the previous discussion shows that there is a canonical continuous functor from the dagger site on X to the compact Stein site on X, which is in fact an immersion.

Let's see a feature that distinguish the archimedean and the non-archimedean world with respect to the properties of subdomains. In the non-archimedean world the Weierstrass subdomains satisfy the transitivity property, *i.e.* if $V \subset U$ is a Weierstrass subdomain and $U \subset X$ is a Weierstrass subdomain, then $V \subset X$ is a Weierstrass subdomain. The proof of this result is based on the "rigidity" of Weierstrass subdomains, *i.e.* to the fact that if $X(f_1, ..., f_n)$ and $X(g_1, ..., g_n)$ are Weierstrass subdomains and $|f_i - g_i|_{sup} \leqslant 1$ for any i then $X(f_1, ..., f_n) = X(g_1, ..., g_n)$. This is conseguence of the non-archimedean character of $|\cdot|_{sup}$ which fails in the archimedean world. Take for example the functions $z, \frac{3z}{2} \in W^1_{\mathbb{C}}$. Then $|z - \frac{3z}{2}|_{sup} = |-\frac{z}{2}|_{sup} \leqslant 1$ but $X(z) \neq X(\frac{3z}{2})$ as dagger subdomains of $\mathcal{M}(W^1_{\mathbb{C}})$.

Hence we can produce a counter-example to the transitivity of Weierstrass dagger subdomains in the archimedean case. Let $f(z) = 4z - \frac{1}{2}$ and consider the subdomain $X(f) \subset \mathcal{M}(W^1_{\mathbb{C}})$. By theorem 5.1.4 we know that $A_{X(f)} \cong T^1_{\mathbb{C}}(\frac{1}{4})$ in a non-canonical way, because the center of the disk is placed at $z = \frac{1}{2}$. Now, the function $\frac{1}{z}$ is analytical and well defined on $X(f)$ and so the subset

$$U = \{x \in X(f) || \frac{1}{z}| \leqslant \frac{8}{3}\} \subset X(f)$$

is a Weierstrass subdomain of $X(f)$ but it is not a Weierstrass subdomain of $\mathcal{M}(W^1_{\mathbb{C}})$, it is Laurent.

This cannot happen in the non-archimedean case because it is impossible to "move" the centres of the disks since all the k-rational points of the disk are centres.

Now we remove the constrain on k to be archimedean, and come back to study general definitions.

Definition 5.1.19. *Let $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be a k-dagger affinoid space, then we will define the* ring of germs of analytic functions *at $x \in X$ as*

$$\mathcal{O}_{X,x} = \varinjlim A_V,$$

where V varies over the family of k-dagger affinoid subdomains of X that contains x.

Remark 5.1.20. The previous definition is different from the definition of $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ given by Berkovich for the fact that we don't ask for V to varies over the set of dagger affinoid neighborhoods of x. We can do this, obtaining the right result (*i.e.* $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ coincides with the local ring of x of Berkovich geometry) because we are working with germs of analytic functions.

Definition 5.1.21. *Let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a map of k-dagger affinoid spaces, we say that ϕ is an* open immersion *if it's injective and the induced map*

$$\phi^*_x : \mathcal{O}_{Y,\phi(x)} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$$

is a bijection for any $x \in X$.

Proposition 5.1.22. *If k is archimedean then $\mathcal{O}_{X,z}$ is a k-dagger affinoid algebra and the open immersion $\{z\} \hookrightarrow X$ is a Weierstrass subdomain embedding.*

Proof. Consider the case $X = \mathcal{M}(W^n_k)$ and $k = \mathbb{C}$. Then given any $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ with $|z_i| \leqslant 1$ we can choose other $2n$ points for any $r > 0$ defined

$$\alpha_i = (\alpha_{1,i} = z_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i,i} = z_i + r, \ldots, \alpha_{n,i} = z_n)$$

$$\beta_i = (\beta_{1,i} = z_1, \ldots, \beta_{i,i} = z_i - r, \ldots, \beta_{n,i} = z_n)$$

Then the $\mathbb{C}$-dagger affinoid subdomains

$$U = \{y \in \mathcal{M}(W_k^n) || g_1(y)| \leqslant r, \dots, |g_n(y)| \leqslant r, |h_1(y)| \leqslant r, \dots, |h_n(y)| \leqslant r\} = \{z\}$$

where

$$g_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_i + \alpha_i, h_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_i + \beta_i$$

is the required Weierstrass subdomain representation of $\{z\}$. If $k = \mathbb{R}$ and z is $\mathbb{R}$-rational then we can reason as above. Otherwise, if $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ is not an $\mathbb{R}$-rational point, then we can consider $\overline{z} = (\overline{z}_1, \dots, \overline{z}_n)$ and the real number $y = (z_1\overline{z}_1, \dots, z_2\overline{z}_2)$, now defining α and β as above the subdomain

$$U = \{y \in \mathcal{M}(W_k^n) || g_1(y)| \leqslant r, \dots, |g_n(y)| \leqslant r, |h_1(y)| \leqslant r, \dots, |h_n(y)| \leqslant r\} = \{z\}$$

where

$$g_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_i^2 - \alpha_i, h_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_i^2 - \beta_i$$

is the required subdomain.

Finally, if X is a general k-dagger affinoid domain then there exists a closed immersion $\phi : X \to W_k^n$ and the pullback of $\{x\} \subset W_k^n$ is a subdomain of X of Weierstrass type $\{\phi^*(x)\}$, because ϕ is injective. □

Corollary 5.1.23. *$A_{\{x\}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ if k is archimedean.*

Proof. Particular case of theorem 5.1.4. □

Corollary 5.1.24. *$\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a local Noetherian ring.*

Proof. Well known both in archimedean and non-archimedean case. □

Example 5.1.25. In this example we would like to explain better the properties shown so far with a very concrete and explicit example. At first sight can seems quite strange that there exist some dagger algebras such that

$$\frac{W_{\mathbb{C}}^n}{I} \cong \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$$

for the local ring at a point in a dagger affinoid space $x \in X = \mathcal{M}(A)$, over $\mathbb{C}$. *i.e.* that the ring obtained by quotienting $W_{\mathbb{C}}^n$ by some particular ideal must become a local ring, which is something that never happen quotienting $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ or (with K non-archimedean) in $K\langle X_1, \dots, X_n\rangle$. So, let's take the easiest (non-trivial) example where this happen to see explicitly this phenomena. Consider $W_{\mathbb{C}} = W_{\mathbb{C}}^1$ and the Weierstrass subdomain of $\mathcal{M}(W_{\mathbb{C}}) \cong \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(1^+)$, given by the polynomial $f = z + 2$. The region of the complex plane such that $|f| \leqslant 1$ is the disk $|z + 2| \leqslant 1$ *i.e.* is a disk of radius 1 centered in -2, so the intersection of this region with the spectrum of $W_{\mathbb{C}}$ is only one point on the border: -1.

By definition the dagger algebra associated to this dagger affinoid subdomain is given by

$$\frac{W_{\mathbb{C}}\langle X\rangle^\dagger}{(X - f)} \cong \frac{\mathbb{C}\langle z, X\rangle^\dagger}{(X - z - 2)}.$$

Now we saw that as a set

$$\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{\mathbb{C}\langle z, X\rangle^\dagger}{(X - z - 2)}\right) = \{x \in \mathcal{M}(W_{\mathbb{C}}^2) | X - z - 2 = 0\} =$$

$$= \{x \in \mathbb{C}^2 || X| \leqslant 1, |z| \leqslant 1, X - z - 2 = 0\} = \{(1, -1) \in \mathbb{C}^2\}.$$

So really the spectrum of $W_{\mathbb{C}}\langle f\rangle^{\dagger}$ is one point and

$$W_{\mathbb{C}}\langle f\rangle^{\dagger} \cong \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \frac{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{-}))}{(X-z-2)}$$

i.e. $W_{\mathbb{C}}\langle f\rangle^{\dagger}$ is isomorphic to the direct limit of the ring of holomorphic functions of the point $(1,-1)$ in the hyperplane given by $X-z-2=0$, because the open sets (in the hyperplane) $\mathcal{M}(\frac{\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{C}}(\rho^{-}))}{(X-z-2)})$ are a basis of open neighborhood of $(1,-1)$.

Proposition 5.1.26. *Let $\phi : U \hookrightarrow X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be a k-dagger affinoid subdomain embedding, then ϕ is an open immersion.*

Proof. Clear. □

Proposition 5.1.27. *Every k-dagger affinoid space $\mathcal{M}(A)$ has a basis for the weak topology formed by good open connected subsets countable at infinity.*

Proof. We can reason in the same way as [28], proposition 2.2.8. Let U be an open neighborhood of $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ and choose a roomy Weierstrass subdomain $V(f_1,\ldots,f_n)$ such that $V \subset U$ (we can always do it because they are a base of closed neighborhood of the topology of $\mathcal{M}(A)$). Let's choose a monotonic increasing sequence of real numbers $\{\epsilon_i\}$ such that $0<\epsilon_i<1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ define the sequence of subdomains

$$V_i = X(\epsilon_i f_1,\ldots,\epsilon_i f_n).$$

Let's choose for any V_i the connected component $W_i \subset V_i$ which contains x. So, W_i is a Weierstrass roomy connected neighborhood of x and each W_i lies in the topological interior of W_{i+1}, then

$$W = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} W_i$$

is an open connected neighborhood which is countable at infinity. □

5.2 The Gerritzen-Grauert theorem

Definition 5.2.1. *A morphism of k-dagger affinoid spaces $f : X = \mathcal{M}(A) \to Y = \mathcal{M}(B)$, is called* closed immersion *if $f^{*} : B \to A$ is surjective.*

Definition 5.2.2. *A morphism of k-dagger affinoid spaces $f : X \to Y$, is called* locally closed immersion *if the induced homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{Y,f(x)} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is surjective for any $x \in X$.*

Definition 5.2.3. *A morphism of k-dagger affinoid spaces $f : X \to Y$, is called* Runge immersion *if it factors in a diagram*



where g is a closed immersion and $h : Y' \to Y$ is a Weierstrass domain embedding.

We need a couple of lemmas.

Lemma 5.2.4. *Let $\phi : A \to B$ be a morphism of k-dagger affinoid algebras then ϕ is surjective if and only if there exists a system of dagger affinoid generators $h_1, ..., h_t \in B$ and $l_1, ..., l_t \in A^\circ$ such that $\phi(l_i) = h_i$ (the l_i might not be a full system of generators of A).*

Proof. If $B = k\langle h_1, ..., h_t\rangle^\dagger$ and there exists $l_1, ..., l_t \in A^\circ$ such that $\phi(l_i) = h_i$ then we can compose the canonical morphism $W_k^n \to A$ with ϕ obtaining a surjective map $W_k^n \to B$, by the definition of generators. Hence ϕ is surjective.

On the other hand let $\phi : A \to B$ be surjective and let $\psi : W_k^n \to A$ be the canonical map defining A. The composition $\phi \circ \psi : W_k^n = k\langle X_1, ..., X_n\rangle^\dagger \to B$ is surjective and so $(\phi \circ \psi)(X_i)$ is a system of affinoid generators of B and $\psi(X_i) \in A^\circ$ and the image of $\psi(X_i)$ is a system of affinoid generators of B. □

Lemma 5.2.5. *Let $\phi : A \to B$ be a surjective morphism of k-dagger affinoid algebras, then we can find $\rho > 1$ such that for any $1 < \rho' < \rho$ the induced maps $\phi_{\rho'} : A_{\rho'} \to B_{\rho'}$ are surjective.*

Proof. Keeping the same notation we write

$$A \cong \varinjlim_{1<\rho} \frac{T_k^n(\rho)}{(f_1, ..., f_r)_\rho} = \varinjlim A_\rho$$

$$B \cong \varinjlim_{1<\rho} \frac{T_k^m(\rho)}{(g_1, ..., g_s)_\rho} = \varinjlim B_\rho,$$

knowing that we can suppose $f_i \in T_k^n(\rho)$ and $g_j \in T_k^m(\rho)$ for any i, j, because they are in a finite number. We know that we can write

$$B = k\langle h_1, ..., h_t\rangle^\dagger$$

for a finite system of generators of B and a map $\phi : A \to B$ is surjective if and only if there is a set of element $l_1, ..., l_t \in A^\circ$ such that $\phi(l_i) = h_i$. So, by hypothesis these elements exists and since they are a finite number there exists a ρ' such that $l_i \in A_{\rho'}$ for any i. Hence $\phi_\rho : A_\rho \to B_\rho$ is surjective for any $\rho < \rho'$. □

We can state our generalization of the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem.

Theorem 5.2.6. *Let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a locally closed immersion of k-dagger affinoid spaces, then there exists a finite covering of $\phi(X)$ by rational subdomains Y_i of Y such that all morphisms $\phi_i : \phi^{-1}(Y_i) \to Y_i$ are Runge immersions.*

Non-archimedean case:

Proof. We could rewrite the same argumentation done by Temkin in [31], but in the non-archimedean case is more easy to deduce the dagger version of the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem relying on the affinoid one. So, let $\phi : X = \mathcal{M}(A) \to Y = \mathcal{M}(B)$ be a locally closed immersion. Reasoning analogously to proposition 7.3.3/4 of [26] we see that there exists an affinoid subdomain (not necessarily dagger) $Y' \subset Y$ such that $\phi|_{\phi^{-1}(Y')} : \phi^{-1}(Y') \to Y'$ is a closed immersion. But then we can find a dagger affinoid subdomain $Y'' \subset Y'$ for which $\phi|_{\phi^{-1}(Y'')} : \phi^{-1}(Y'') \to Y''$ is a closed immersion. So, we are reduced to the case when $\phi : X \to Y$ is a closed immersion of dagger affinoid spaces and by the lemma 5.2.5 we see that there exist a $\rho > 1$ such that $\phi_\rho : X_\rho \to Y_\rho$ is a closed immersion of affinoid spaces. So we can apply the classical Gerritzen-Grauert theorem to ϕ_ρ to obtain the required finite covering of Y by finite rational k-dagger subdomains.

□

Remark 5.2.7. We remark that (substantially) the same reduction argument from the dagger case to the rigid case explained so far can be found in [33] for the case of strict k-dagger affinoid algebras. So by our approach we can exploit the generalization of Temkin of the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem for all affinoid subdomains in Berkovich theory providing the result also for non-strict dagger algebras.

Archimedean case (the idea of the proof is inspired by the proof of Temkin in [31]):
For this case we need some further lemmas.

Lemma 5.2.8. *Let $A = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} A_\rho$ be a k-dagger affinoid algebra, then $\forall \rho' > 1$ such that $A_{\rho'}$ contains all the affinoid generators of A the algebra*

$$A' = \varinjlim_{\rho>\rho'} A_\rho$$

is a k-dagger affinoid algebra and the canonical map $A' \to A$ is a subdomain embedding, i.e. *$\mathcal{M}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}(A')$ is a subdomain and moreover*

$$A = A'\langle \rho' f_1, ..., \rho' f_n \rangle^\dagger$$

where f_i are the images of $X_1, ..., X_n \in W_k^n(\rho')$ with respect to the canonical map $W_k^n(\rho') \to A'$.

Proof. Let $\pi : W_k^n \to A$ be a presentation of A. Then we know that $W_k^n(\rho')$ is a dagger algebra and so that there exists a surjective map $W_k^m \to W_k^n(\rho')$. Then the map

$$W_k^n(\rho') \to A'$$

obtained by restricting π is clearly surjective and contains all the generators of A. We know that the map $\mathcal{M}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}(A')$ is injective (one can argue noting that $A \hookrightarrow A'$ is dense).

Let $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ be a set of generators of A'. We have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_k^n(\rho') & \longrightarrow & W_k^n \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A' & \longrightarrow & A \end{array}$$

where horizontal maps are canonical injections. The injection $W_k^n(\rho') \hookrightarrow W_k^n$ is a subdomain embedding and is easy to check the isomorphism

$$W_k^n(\rho')\langle \rho'_1 X_1, \ldots, \rho'_n X_n \rangle \cong W_k^n.$$

By the commutativity of the previous diagram we see that for all i the element $\rho'_i f_i$ is mapped to a generator of A and so that

$$A = A'\langle \rho'_1 f_1, ..., \rho'_n f_n \rangle^\dagger$$

hence $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is a Weierstrass subdomain of $\mathcal{M}(A')$. □

Lemma 5.2.9. *Let $A = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} A_\rho$ be a k-dagger affinoid algebra and let $\phi : A \to B = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} B_\rho$ be a dagger subdomain embedding, and let $\rho' > 1$ be such that $B_{\rho'}$ all generators of B and $A_{\rho'}$ all generators of A then $\mathcal{M}(B_\rho)$ is an open Stein subspace of $\mathcal{M}(A_\rho)$ for $1 < \rho < \rho'$.*

Proof. We know that $\phi : A \to B$ is an open immersion. This mean that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}(B),x} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}(A),x}$ and this implies that for sufficiently small ρ the map $\mathcal{M}(B_\rho) \to \mathcal{M}(A_\rho)$ is an open immersion. And our choice of ρ' is well suited. □

Lemma 5.2.10. *Let $\phi : A = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} A_\rho \to B = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} B_\rho$ be a dagger subdomain embedding and $\rho' > 1$ be such that $B_{\rho'}$ contains all generators of B and $A_{\rho'}$ contains all generators of A, then*

$$A \to A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B'$$

is a roomy dagger subdomain of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ containing $\mathcal{M}(B)$, where we denotes

$$A' = \varinjlim_{\rho>\rho'} A_\rho, B' = \varinjlim_{\rho>\rho'} B_\rho.$$

Proof. First we notice that in the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A' & \longrightarrow & B' \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A & \longrightarrow & B \end{array}$$

all the maps are subdomain embeddings and also by lemma 5.2.8 the vertical maps are Weierstrass subdomain embedding. Now, considering the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A' & \xrightarrow{\psi} & A \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi'} & & \\ B' & & \end{array}$$

we can calculate the pushout $A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B'$. Moreover, by definition of the pushout there is a unique map $A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B' \to B$ which makes the following diagram commutative



.

We claim that the maps $A \to A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B'$ and $A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B' \to B$ are dagger subdomain embeddings. $A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B'$ is by definition a subdomain of A', so given a map of dagger algebras $A \to C$ such that $\mathrm{Im}\,(\mathcal{M}(C)) \subset \mathcal{M}(A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B')$ then by composition we get a map $A' \to A \to C$ and hence a unique map $A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B' \to C$ which make the diagram commutative. Hence $\mathcal{M}(A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B')$ is a subdomain of $\mathcal{M}(A)$. By definition $\mathcal{M}(B)$ is contained in $\mathcal{M}(A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B')$ as a set and since the intersection of two subdomain is a subdomain then $\mathcal{M}(B)$ is a subdomian of $\mathcal{M}(A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B')$.

Moreover $A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B'$ is roomy in A because $\mathcal{M}(A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B') = \mathcal{M}(A) \cap \mathcal{M}(B')$ and so $\mathcal{M}(A) \cap \mathcal{M}(B_\rho) \subset \mathcal{M}(A \otimes^\dagger_{A'} B')$ for any $1 < \rho < \rho'$. □

Remark 5.2.11. In the previous lemma we found ourself more comfortable to work with dagger affinoid algebras instead of dagger affinoid spaces. This can be somewhat confusing and can make harder to see the geometrical aspect of the discussion. So for the convenience of the reader we put the dual diagram of the maps that we found above to help to visualize what is happening



So let's prove the archimedean case of Gerritzen-Grauert theorem.

Proof. Let $\phi : X = \mathcal{M}(A) \to Y = \mathcal{M}(B)$ be a locally closed immersion. This mean that ϕ is injective and for each $x \in X$ there is a surjection

$$\phi_x^* : \mathcal{O}_{Y,\phi(x)} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}.$$

As we saw so far, in the archimedean case $\mathcal{O}_{Y,\phi(x)}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ are k-dagger affinoid algebras and $\{x\}, \{\phi(x)\}$ are dagger subdomains of Weierstrass type of X and Y respectively. So we can write

$$\mathcal{O}_{Y,\phi(x)} = B\langle f_1, ..., f_n\rangle^{\dagger}, \mathcal{O}_{X,x} = A\langle g_1, ..., g_m\rangle^{\dagger}$$

for $f_1, ..., f_n \in B$ and $g_1, ..., g_m \in A$. We known that this implies that, if we write

$$A\langle f_1, ..., f_n\rangle^{\dagger} = \varinjlim (A\langle f_1, ..., f_n\rangle)_\rho \to B\langle g_1, ..., g_m\rangle^{\dagger} = \varinjlim (B\langle g_1, ..., g_m\rangle)_\rho$$

then there exists a ρ' such that for every $\rho < \rho'$, ϕ^* becomes a map of systems and the maps

$$\phi_\rho^* : D_{\rho'} = (B\langle f_1, ..., f_n\rangle)_{\rho'} \to C_{\rho'} = (A\langle g_1, ..., g_m\rangle)_{\rho'}$$

are surjective, by lemma 5.2.5.

Now by previous lemmas if we define

$$A' = \varinjlim_{\rho > \rho'} A_\rho, B' = \varinjlim_{\rho > \rho'} B_\rho$$

and

$$C' = \varinjlim_{\rho > \rho'} C_\rho, D' = \varinjlim_{\rho > \rho'} B_\rho.$$

These algebras fits into the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B' & \longrightarrow & A' \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ D' & \longrightarrow & C' \end{array}$$

hence we can define the pushouts $C'' = A \otimes^{\dagger}_{A'} C'$ and $D'' = B \otimes^{\dagger}_{B'} D'$. By the previous lemma these algebras define two roomy subdomains of X and Y respectively containing x

and $\phi(x)$ respectively. Moreover the inclusion $\mathcal{M}(D'')\hookrightarrow Y$ and $\mathcal{M}(C'')\hookrightarrow X$ defines roomy Weirstrass subdomains. We reason on the inclusion $\mathcal{M}(C'')\hookrightarrow X$, the same can be done for $\mathcal{M}(D'')\hookrightarrow Y$ changing A with B and C with D. In the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A' & \longrightarrow & A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C' & \longrightarrow & C \end{array}$$

we know that 3 maps are Weierstrass subdomain embedding, hence also the fourth is, so the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A' & \longrightarrow & A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C' & \longrightarrow & A \otimes^{\dagger}_{A'} C' \end{array}$$

tell us that $\mathcal{M}(A \otimes^{\dagger}_{A'} C') = \mathcal{M}(A) \cap \mathcal{M}(C') = \mathcal{M}(C'')$ is an intersection of two Weierstrass subdomain of $\mathcal{M}(A')$ so is Weierstrass. The surjection $\psi : C' \to D'$ gives a surjection

$$D'' \to C''$$

mapping $D'' = D' \otimes_{B'} B \ni x \otimes_{B'} y \mapsto \psi(x) \otimes_{A'} \phi^*(y)$ because A' is dense in A and so for each $\phi^*(y)$ can find a sequence of elements $\{a_n\} \subset A'$ converging bornologically to $\phi^*(y)$. And since $C' \otimes_{A'} A$ is bornologically complete the map $D'' \to C''$ is surjective. Hence the map $\phi : X \to Y$ factors in the following way

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(D'') & \longrightarrow & Y \\ & \nwarrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \\ & & \mathcal{M}(C'') & & \end{array}$$

where $\mathcal{M}(C'') \to Y$ is a Runge immersion, and $\mathcal{M}(C'') \to X$ is a Weierstrass subdomain embedding. The fact that $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{M}(D''))$ is equal to $\mathcal{M}(C'')$ follows from the fact that the map $D'' \to C''$ is induced by ϕ^*. Finally, since $\mathcal{M}(D'') \subset Y$ is roomy we can cover Y with a finite number of this subdomains $D''_1, \ldots, D''_r$ and find the finite covering $\phi^{-1}(D''_1), \ldots, \phi^{-1}(D''_n)$ of X required. □

The main corollary of the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem is the following.

Corollary 5.2.12. *Let X be a k-dagger affinoid space and $U \subset X$ then there exists a finite number of rational subdomains $U_i \subset X$ such that $\bigcup U_i = U$.*

Corollary 5.2.13. *Let X be a dagger affinoid space, then the G-topology generated by finite covering by dagger subdomains and by finite covering by rational subdomains coincide.*

Remark 5.2.14. We remark a subtle point that shows, once more, the difference between the archimedean and the non-archimedean geometry we are constructing. In the proof of our version of the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem we showed that we can factor locally closed immersion in a Runge immersion followed by a Weierstrass domain embedding, choosing a suitable dagger affinoid covering of the codomain. Using the intuition developed in non-archimedean rigid geometry one would deduce from this that in the archimedean case one

could write any dagger affinoid subdomain as a finite union of Weierstrass subdomains. But this is false! For two reasons: one simply because it's false, one can check that is a false statement. Second, because we saw in the previous section (see the discussion after the remark 5.1.18) that in the archimedean case, unlike the non-archimedean case, the transitivity property of Weierstrass subdomains fails! So the composition of two Weierstrass embedding in general is a rational embedding. With this difference in mind, we see that in the archimedean case we cannot obtain a stronger statement in this direction. So what we get is the last corollaries which are the precise generalization of the known one in the theory of affinoid algebras, valid in the same fashion uniformly in the archimedean case and in the non-archimedean case.

So, resuming this chapter, we showed that each archimedean rational dagger subdomain is a compact Stein and that each dagger affinoid subdomain can be written as a finite union of rational subdomains. Since the union of a finite family of compact Stein subsets is not a compact Stein subset, as also the union of a finite family of dagger affinoid subdomains is not a dagger affinoid subdomain we can ask the following question:

Question 5.2.15. Let $k = \mathbb{C}$ and $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be a $\mathbb{C}$-dagger affinoid space. Does it exists a dagger affinoid subdomain $U \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ which is not a compact Stein subset?

Chapter 6

Dagger analytic spaces over a valued field

6.1 Coherent sheaves over a dagger affinoid space

Before starting to develop the globalization of the dagger affinoid theory we showed so far, we collect some properties of the modules over our dagger algebras. Our aim is to reconstruct classical results up to Kiehl theorem. All the proves are adaptations of the classical ones.

For any ring A we denote with $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ the category of modules over A with A-linear morphisms and with $\mathbf{Mod}^f(A)$ the full subcategory of $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ determined by finite A-modules.

Definition 6.1.1. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra, we say that a bornological A-module is a* finite dagger module *(or simply a* dagger module*) if there exist a strict epimorphism $A^n \to M$. We denote with $\mathbf{Mod}^f(A)^\dagger$ the category of finite dagger A-modules with bounded A-linear morphisms.*

Lemma 6.1.2. *Let $A = \varinjlim_{\rho>1} A_\rho$ be a k-dagger affinoid algebra, then we have the following equivalence of categories*

$$\mathbf{Mod}(A) \cong \varprojlim_{\rho>1} \mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho).$$

Proof. First of all let's note that the association $A \mapsto \mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is a contravariant functor from the category of rings to the 2-category of all categories (ignoring the set-theoretical issue of giving a rigorous definition of the category of all categories). Let A, B be two rings and $A \to B$ a ring homomorphism, then any B-module is naturally an A-module. Hence given the system defining A we get a dual system with which we can calculate $\varprojlim \mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho)$. The category of categories is complete and cocomplete and applying the definition of limits we obtain

$$\mathrm{ob}\,(\varprojlim_{\rho>1} \mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho)) = \varprojlim_{\rho>1} \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho))$$

and for any $M, N \in \varprojlim_{\rho>1} \mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho)$

$$\mathrm{Hom}\,(M, N) = \varprojlim_{\tau>1} \varinjlim_{\rho>1} \mathrm{Hom}\,(M_\rho, N_\tau).$$

Now, let $M \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Mod}(A))$, this mean that M is an A_ρ-module for any $\rho > 1$, in a compatible way, so $M \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho))$ and can be identified with an object $F(M) \in$

$\mathrm{ob}\,(\varprojlim_{\rho>1}\mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho))$. Then, let $\phi : M \to N$ be a morphism of A-modules: this mean that for any $m_1, m_2 \in M$ and $a_1, a_2 \in A$

$$\phi(a_1m_1 + a_2m_2) = a_1\phi(m_1) + a_2\phi(m_2)$$

and since the morphisms of the system which defines A are injective this implies that ϕ is also a A_ρ-module morphism for any $\rho > 1$. So can be identified with an element of $\varprojlim_{\tau>1}\varinjlim_{\rho>1}\mathrm{Hom}\,(M_\rho, N_\tau)$ hence we get a functor $F : \mathbf{Mod}(A) \to \varprojlim_{\rho>1}\mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho)$, we have to show that it is an equivalence. F is obviously faithful (since any module morphism is a morphism of underlying abelian groups), and is full because given a morphism $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\varprojlim_{\rho>1}\mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho)}(M, N)$ then this mean that for any $a_1, a_2 \in A_\rho$, and for any $\rho > 1$

$$\phi(a_1m_1 + a_2m_2) = a_1\phi(m_1) + a_2\phi(m_2)$$

and so ϕ is an A-module morphisms. It remains to show that F is essentially surjective, so given an object $M \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\varprojlim_{\rho>1}\mathbf{Mod}(A_\rho))$, M has a structure of A_ρ-module for any ρ and these structures are compatible with respect to the maps $A_\rho \to A_{\rho'}$, so to M we can give canonically the structure of an A-module and denote it by $\widetilde{M}$. By definition $F(\widetilde{M}) \cong M$ which shows that F is an equivalence. □

Definition 6.1.3. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra and M an A-module. The free module A^μ, for any cardinal μ, has a canonical filtration induced by the filtration of A, then any surjection*

$$\psi : A^\mu \to M$$

induces a filtration on M and we call it the canonical filtration *on M with respect to ψ and denotes its elements by*

$$M = \varinjlim_{\rho>1}(M_\psi)_\rho$$

where $(M_\psi)_\rho = \phi((A^\mu)_\rho)$.

In general this filtration has not good properties.

Proposition 6.1.4. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra, M a finite A-module and $\psi : A^n \to M$, $\psi' : A^m \to M$ two presentation of M, then there exists a $\rho' > 1$ such that for any $1 < \rho < \rho'$*

$$(M_\psi)_\rho = (M_{\psi'})_\rho$$

and $(M_\psi)_\rho$ are all finitely generated A_ρ-modules.

Proof. First of all we notice that the fact that A is Noetherian implies that M is of finite presentation, hence we can write the following exact sequences

$$A^{n'} \xrightarrow{\phi} A^n \xrightarrow{\psi} M \to 0$$

$$A^{m'} \xrightarrow{\phi'} A^m \xrightarrow{\psi'} M \to 0$$

and so $M \cong \mathrm{Coker}\,(\phi) \cong \mathrm{Coker}\,(\phi')$. Moreover we have the canonical morphism $(A_\rho)^{n'} \hookrightarrow A^{n'}$ and $(A_\rho)^n \hookrightarrow A^n$. Now, let's write $\{f_1, \ldots, f_{n'}\}$ for a base for $A^{n'}$ and $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ for a base for A^n, so

$$\phi(f_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i,j}e_j$$

for some $a_{i,j} \in A$. Since $\{a_{i,j}\}$ is a finite subset of A, we can find a ρ such that $a_{i,j} \in A_{\rho'}$ for any $\rho' < \rho$. So, this shows that we can find a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A^{n'} & \xrightarrow{\phi} & A^n & \xrightarrow{\psi} & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ (A_\rho)^{n'} & \xrightarrow{\phi_\rho} & (A_\rho)^n & \xrightarrow{\psi_\rho} & \mathrm{Coker}\,(\phi_\rho) & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

where $\mathrm{Coker}\,(\phi_\rho) = (M_\phi)_\rho$ and the map ϕ_ρ is simply defined by mapping $f_i \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j} e_j$.

Now consider the two systems of generators $\{\psi(e_1), \dots, \psi(e_n)\}$ and $\{\psi'(e'_1), \dots, \psi'(e'_m)\}$ of M. Since they generate M we can write

$$\psi(e_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m b_{i,j} \psi'(e'_j)$$

and

$$\psi'(e'_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n c_{i,j} \psi(e_j)$$

for some $c_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \in A$. So considering ρ small enough to have $c_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \in A_\rho$, so the A_ρ-submodule of M generated by $\{\psi(e_1), \dots, \psi(e_n)\}$ and by $\{\psi'(e'_1), \dots, \psi'(e'_m)\}$ is the same, hence

$$(M_\phi)_\rho = \mathrm{Coker}\,(\phi_\rho) = \mathrm{Coker}\,(\phi'_\rho) = (M_{\phi'})_\rho$$

which conclude the proof. □

So by the previous proposition, when we deal with finite A-module we suppress the dependence of the filtration with respect to ψ and we always suppose to have chosen a ρ sufficiently small to do this.

Proposition 6.1.5. *Let $\phi : M \to N$ be a morphism between finite A-modules, then ϕ respect the filtration* i.e. *there is a $\rho' > 1$ such that for any $\rho < \rho'$, ϕ induces a morphism*

$$\phi_\rho : M_\rho \to N_\rho$$

of A_ρ-Banach modules.

Proof. Let $\{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$ be a set of generators of M, then $\phi(M)$ is generated by $\{\phi(m_1), \dots, \phi(m_n)\}$. Now, let $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$ be a set of generators of N. We can find, as did in the previous proposition, a ρ such that we can write every $\phi(m_i)$ as a A_ρ-linear combination of $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$. So with this choice of ρ we have that $\phi(M_\rho)$ is a A_ρ-submodule of N which is clearly contained in N_ρ. □

Proposition 6.1.6. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra, then the category of finite A-modules is equivalent to the category of finite dagger modules.*

Proof. If $M \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Mod}^f(A))$ it exists an epimorphism $\phi : A^n \to M$. So the kernel of ϕ is a submodules of A^n (whose submodules are all bornologically closed), so M can be endowed with the quotient bornology induced by ϕ, which turns out to be separated.

To end the proof we need to show that every linear map between two objects $M, N \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Mod}^f(A))$, endowed with the dagger bornology, is bounded. Let $\phi : A^n \to M$ be a strict epimorphism and $\psi : M \to N$ be a linear map, by the universal property of the quotient bornology, ψ is bounded if and only if $\psi \circ \phi$ is bounded. There exists a ρ such that $\psi \circ \phi$

factors in a morphism $(\psi \circ \phi)_\rho : (A_\rho)^n \to N_\rho$, with respect to the canonical filtrations and so if $f = \sum a_i e_i \in A^n$, then defining $C = \max\{(\psi \circ \phi)_\rho(e_i)\}$, we have that

$$\|(\psi \circ \phi)_\rho(f)\|_{N_\rho} \leqslant C \sum \|a_i\|_\rho \leqslant C\|f\|_{(A^n)_\rho}.$$

Hence $(\psi \circ \phi)_\rho$ is bounded for any $\rho' < \rho$, which implies that $\psi \circ \phi$ is bounded. □

Let now A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra and M be any A-module. We can write

$$M = \varinjlim_{N \subset M} M$$

where N varies over the family of finitely generated A-submodules of M and we can equip M with the direct limit bornology induced by this limit. We call it the *dagger bornology* of M. So we can readily deduce the following corollary.

Corollary 6.1.7. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra. The category of dagger modules over A,* i.e. *the category of A-modules equipped with the dagger bornology, is equivalent to* $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$.

Proof. We have to show that any A-linear map $f : M \to N$ between A-module is bounded when we consider on both M and N the dagger bornology. But this follow easily from previous proposition since the category of dagger modules is equivalent to the category of essential monomorphic objects of $\mathbf{Ind}(\mathbf{Mod}^f(A))$ and because morphisms are system morphism and morphisms between finite A-modules are all bounded and the direct limit bornology is precisely the one for which these morphisms are bounded. □

We notice that, since every finite A-dagger module is a complete bornological k-vector space of convex type, then also any A-module with its dagger bornology is complete.

Definition 6.1.8. *Let A be a commutative, unital complete bornological k-algebra. We say that a complete bornological k-algebra B is a* A-dagger affinoid algebra *if there exists a strict epimorphism $A\langle \rho_1 X_1, \dots, \rho_n X_n \rangle^\dagger \to B$.*

Corollary 6.1.9. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra, B an $A-$dagger affinoid algebra and $M, N \in \mathbf{Mod}^f(A)^\dagger$. Then*

1. *$M \otimes_A^\dagger N \cong M \otimes_A N \in \mathbf{Mod}^f(A)^\dagger$;*
2. *$M \otimes_A^\dagger B \cong M \otimes_A B \in \mathbf{Mod}^f(B)^\dagger$;*
3. *any A-linear morphism $M \to N$ is strict.*

Proof. All the three assertion are formal consequence of the equivalence showed in proposition 6.1.6. □

Lemma 6.1.10. *Let $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be a strict k-dagger affinoid subdomain, $x \in \mathrm{Max}\,(A) \subset X$ and $\mathfrak{m}_x$ the maximal ideal corresponding to x. The canonical map $A \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ factor through the localization $A_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$, which is embedded in $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. Moreover we get isomorphisms*

$$\frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}_x^n A} \to \frac{A_{\mathfrak{m}_x}}{\mathfrak{m}_x^n A_{\mathfrak{m}_x}} \to \frac{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}{\mathfrak{m}_x^n \mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\widehat{A} \to \widehat{A_{\mathfrak{m}_x}} \to \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$$

between the $\mathfrak{m}_x$-adic completions.

Proof. Let's consider the closed immersion $\mathcal{M}(A/\mathfrak{m}_x^n)\hookrightarrow\mathcal{M}(A)$ given by the quotient map $A \to \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}_x^n}$. The space $\mathcal{M}(A/\mathfrak{m}_x^n)$ has only one point and it's an easy consequence of proposition 3.5.5 that

$$\frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}_x^n A} \cong \frac{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}{\mathfrak{m}_x^n \mathcal{O}_{X,x}}.$$

Moreover, since

$$\mathfrak{m}_x\mathcal{O}_{X,x} = \{h \in \mathcal{O}_{X,x} | h(x) = 0\}$$

then every element of $A - \mathfrak{m}_x$ is mapped to units in $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, so the map $A \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ factor through $A_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$. So we get the bijection on quotients and on $\mathfrak{m}_x$-adic completions. We need only to show that the map $A_{\mathfrak{m}_x} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is injective, and this follows from Krull intersection theorem which implies that $\widehat{A_{\mathfrak{m}_x}}$ is Hausdorff and so

$$A_{\mathfrak{m}_x} \to \widehat{A_{\mathfrak{m}_x}} \cong \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}$$

is injective, hence also $A_{\mathfrak{m}_x} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is injective. □

Lemma 6.1.11. *Let $r_1, \dots, r_n \in \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0} - \sqrt{|k^\times|}$ and K a valued extension of k such that $r_1, \dots, r_n \in \sqrt{|K^\times|}$, then a sequence $M \to N \to P$ of k-dagger module morphisms is exact if and only if the sequence*

$$M \otimes_k^\dagger K \to N \otimes_k^\dagger K \to P \otimes_k^\dagger K.$$

Proof. By proposition 6.1.5 from the exact sequence $M \to N \to P$ we get a system of exact sequences

$$M_\rho \to N_\rho \to P_\rho$$

of k-Banach spaces for some sufficiently small $\rho > 1$. The fact that the exactness of these sequences implies the exactness of $M \to N \to P$ follows from the exactness of the functor $\varinjlim$, and the converse follows from the characterization of the canonical filtration saw above. Then, in [28] is shown that the exactness of $M_\rho \to N_\rho \to P_\rho$ is equivalent to the exactness of the sequences

$$M_\rho \widehat{\otimes}_k K \to N_\rho \widehat{\otimes}_k K \to P_\rho \widehat{\otimes}_k K$$

which, by the same reasoning above, implies the exactness we need to show. □

Remark 6.1.12. We underline that, also if not explicit mentioned, the previous lemma applies only for k non-archimedean.

Proposition 6.1.13. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra and $V \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ a dagger affinoid subdomain, then A_V is a flat A-algebra.*

Proof. Suppose first that V is a strict dagger affinoid subdomain. Let $x \in \operatorname{Max}(A_V) \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ and let $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$, $\mathfrak{m}_V \subset A_V$ the corresponding maximal ideals. By the lemma 6.1.10 the map $A \to A_V$ induces a bijection $\widehat{A} \to \widehat{A_V}$ between the $\mathfrak{m}$-adic completion of A and the $\mathfrak{m}_V$-adic completion of A_V. It is a well known result of commutative algebra that this implies that A_V is a flat A-algebra.

For the non-strict case, we can reason in the same way of [28], proposition 2.2.4. Consider a complete valued field K/k such that $A \otimes_k^\dagger K$ and $A_V \otimes_k^\dagger K$ are strict, and an injective morphism $\phi : M \to N$ of finite A-modules. We can endow M and N with their canonical k-dagger bornology and so the injection $\phi : M \to N$ becomes a strict morphism of bornological modules, so also the morphism $\phi : M \otimes_k^\dagger K \to N \otimes_k^\dagger K$ is injective, and also necessarily strict. $A_V \otimes_k^\dagger K$ is a flat $A \otimes_k^\dagger K$ algebra, hence the morphism

$$\phi : (M \otimes_k^\dagger K) \otimes^\dagger_{A \otimes_k^\dagger K} (A_V \otimes_k^\dagger K) \to (N \otimes_k^\dagger K) \otimes^\dagger_{A \otimes_k^\dagger K} (A_V \otimes_k^\dagger K)$$

is injective. Moreover, we have

$$(M \otimes_k^\dagger K) \otimes^\dagger_{A\otimes_k^\dagger K} A_V \otimes_k^\dagger K \cong (M \otimes_A A_V) \otimes_k^\dagger K$$

because both spaces satisfies the same universal property, and the analogous statement is true for N. So we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \to (M \otimes_A A_V) \otimes_k^\dagger K \to (N \otimes_A A_V) \otimes_k^\dagger K$$

which by lemma 6.1.11 implies the exact sequence

$$0 \to M \otimes_A A_V \to N \otimes_A A_V,$$

which implies that A_V is a flat A-algebra by well know commutative algebra results. □

Now we can state the general version of the Tate's acyclicity theorem.

Theorem 6.1.14. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra and M an A-module, then for any dagger affinoid covering $\{V_i\}$ of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ the Cech complex*

$$0 \to M \to \prod_i M \otimes_A^\dagger A_{V_i} \to \prod_{i,j} M \otimes_A^\dagger A_{V_i \cap V_j} \to \dots$$

is exact and moreover if $M \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Mod}^f(A)^\dagger)$ then the morphism of the complex are all strict.

Proof. For the proof we can use the same reduction to the case of strict algebras and the to the $M = A$ as done in [28] in proposition 2.2.5, since formally we have all the required ingredients: the category of finite A-modules is equivalent to the category of A-dagger modules and $A \to A_V$ is a flat morphism. And the case $M = A$ was shown in chapter 4. □

Remark 6.1.15. In the case $k = \mathbb{C}$ we saw that the dagger subdomains of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ are compact Stein subsets of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ and the acyclicity of coherent analytic sheaves over compact Steins subset is a well known property. So, with Tate acyclicity theorem we recover this result for the case when the coherent sheave is associated to a finite module over the ring of global sections of the structural sheaf.

We recall the following well known definitions for sheaves over G-topological spaces.

Definition 6.1.16. *Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a G-ringed space and $\mathscr{F}$ an $\mathcal{O}_X$-module.*

1. *$\mathscr{F}$ is called* of finite type*, if there exists an admissible covering $(X_i)_{i\in I}$ of X together with exact sequences of type*

$$\mathcal{O}_X^{s_i}|_{X_i} \to \mathscr{F}|_{X_i} \to 0, i \in I,$$

with $s_i \in \mathbb{N}$.

2. *$\mathscr{F}$ is called* of finite presentation*, if there exists an admissible covering $(X_i)_{i\in I}$ of X together with exact sequences of type*

$$\mathcal{O}_X^{r_i}|_{X_i} \to O_X^{s_i}|_{X_i} \to \mathscr{F}|_{X_i} \to 0, i \in I,$$

with $s_i, r_i \in \mathbb{N}$.

3. *$\mathscr{F}$ is called* coherent *if $\mathscr{F}$ is of finite type and if for any admissible open subspace $U \subset X$ the kernel of any morphism $\mathcal{O}_X^s|_U \to \mathscr{F}|_U$ is of finite type.*

Let's now consider on dagger affinoid spaces the weak G-topology given by the finite coverings by dagger affinoid subdomains and whose admissible open subsets are dagger affinoid subdomains. The category of coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules for this G-topology is denoted by $\mathbf{Coh}_W(X)$.

Consider a k-dagger affinoid space $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ and an A-module M. We can look at the functor $\mathscr{F}$ from the category of k-dagger affinoid subdomains in X which associates to any affinoid subdomain $\mathcal{M}(A') \subset X$ the tensor product $M \otimes_A A'$. $\mathscr{F}$ is a presheaf on X with respect to the weak G-topology, and this presheaf is, in fact, a sheaf by Tate's acyclicity theorem, 6.1.14.

Definition 6.1.17. *Let $M \in \mathbf{Mod}(A)$, we call the $\mathcal{O}_X$-module given by*

$$\mathscr{F}(U) = M \otimes_A A'$$

for any dagger affinoid subdomain $U = \mathcal{M}(A') \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$, the $\mathcal{O}_X$-module associated *to the A-module M, and denote it by $\mathscr{F} = M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X$.*

Note that we have

$$(M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X)|_{X'} = (M \otimes_A A') \otimes_{A'} \mathcal{O}_{X'}$$

for the restriction of $M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X$ to any affinoid subdomain $X' = \mathcal{M}(A')$ in X.

Proposition 6.1.18. *Let $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ be a k-dagger affinoid space.*

1. *The functor*
$$\cdot \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X : M \mapsto M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X$$
from A-modules to $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules is fully faithful:

2. *The preceding functor commutes with the formation of kernels, images, cokernels, and tensor products.*

3. *A sequence of A-modules $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ is exact if and only if the associated sequence*
$$0 \to M' \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X \to M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X \to M'' \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X \to 0$$
is exact.

Proof. 1. It is clear that the canonical map

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, M') \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X, M' \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X)$$

is bijective, since any $\mathcal{O}_X$-morphism $M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X \to M' \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X$ is uniquely determined by the inherent A-morphism between $M = M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ and $M' = M' \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X(X)$. Thus, the functor $\cdot \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X$ is fully faithful, which settles assertion.

2. By its construction the functor commutes with tensor products. Next, if

$$0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$$

is an exact sequence of A-modules, the induced sequence

$$0 \to M' \otimes_A A' \to M \otimes_A A' \to M'' \otimes_A A' \to 0$$

is exact for any affinoid subdomain $\mathcal{M}(A') \subset X$, since the corresponding map $A \to A'$ is flat. From this one easily concludes that the functor of taking associated $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules is exact.

3. Using the fact that an A-module M is trivial if and only if $M \otimes_A \mathcal{O}_X$ is trivial.

□

Remark 6.1.19. For a k-dagger affinoid space $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$, we have $\mathcal{O}_X^r = A^r \otimes \mathcal{O}_X$. Furthermore, since A is Noetherian, we conclude from proposition 6.1.18 that kernels and cokernels are associated to A-modules of finite type, so a $\mathcal{O}_X$-module $\mathscr{F}$ is coherent if and only if there exists an admissible dagger affinoid covering $\mathscr{U} = (X_i)_{i\in I}$ of X such that $\mathscr{F}|_{X_i}$ is associated to a finite $\mathcal{O}_{X_i}(X_i)$-module for all $i \in I$.

Definition 6.1.20. *Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a G-ringed space. We say that a sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules, is* $\mathscr{U}$-coherent*, for an admissible covering $\mathscr{U}$, if $\mathscr{F}|_{X_i}$ is associated to a finite $\mathcal{O}_{X_i}(X_i)$-module for all $i \in I$.*

The following proof is an adaptation of the classical argument for proving Kiehl theorem, as one for example can find in [36].

Theorem 6.1.21. *(Kiehl theorem)*
Let A be a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra and $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$. Then an $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules is coherent if and only if is associated to a finite A-dagger module.

Proof. If $\mathscr{F}$ is associated to a finite A-module, then it is coherent as discussed above. The other implication is the hard part, and we proceed by steps following the classical proof done in rigid geometry.

- First step: We start by observing that we can use the same reduction arguments as did in chapter 4 for the Tate acyclity theorem and reduce the problem to strict Laurent coverings and by induction to the convering $X(f) \cup X(f^{-1}) = X$ for $f \in A$. So now, as we did in chapter 4, we can check that the classical proof of Kiehl theorem need only the formal properties of the category of dagger affinoid algebras and the non-archimedean nature of the base field is not needed in the proof.

- Second step: Let's consider the covering $\mathscr{U} = \{U_1 = X(f), U_2 = X(f^{-1})\}$ and let $\mathscr{F}$ be an $\mathscr{U}$-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-module. We claim that $H^1(\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{F}) = 0$. Due to our assumptions, $M_1 = \mathscr{F}(U_1), M_2 = \mathscr{F}(U_2)$, $M_{12} = \mathscr{F}(U_1 \cap U_2)$ are finite modules over $A\langle f\rangle^\dagger$, $A\langle f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$, and $A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$, respectively, and the Cech complex of alternating cochains $C_a^\bullet(\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{F})$ degenerates to

$$0 \to M_1 \times M_2 \xrightarrow{d_0} M_{12} \to 0.$$

  Since $H^1(\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{F})$ can be computed using alternating cochains it is only necessary to show that $d_0 : M_1 \times M_2 \to M_{12}$ is surjective. To do so, recall that we already proved that the map $A\langle f\rangle^\dagger \times A\langle f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger \to A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ is surjective. Next choose elements $v_1, \ldots, v_m \in M_1$ and $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in M_2$ which generate M_1 as an $A\langle f\rangle^\dagger$-module and M_2 as an $A\langle f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$-module. Using the fact that $\mathscr{F}$ is $\mathscr{U}$-coherent, the restrictions of $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ to $U_1 \cap U_2$, as well as the restrictions of $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ to $U_1 \cap U_2$, will generate M_{12} as $A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$-module. Now, let's take the canonical epimorphisms

$$(A\langle f\rangle^\dagger)^m \to M_1$$

$$(A\langle f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger)^n \to M_2.$$

  Since $\mathscr{F}$ is $\mathscr{U}$-coherent, $\mathscr{F}|_{U_1}$ and $\mathscr{F}|_{U_2}$ are generated by global sections, so the above epimorphisms gives two epimorphisms

$$(A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger)^m \to M_{12}$$

$$(A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger)^n \to M_{12}.$$

Now denoting $B = A\langle f\rangle^\dagger \times A\langle f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger$ we get (by construction) the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} B^m \times B^n & \twoheadrightarrow & (A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger)^m \times (A\langle f, f^{-1}\rangle^\dagger)^n & \twoheadrightarrow & M_{12} \times M_{12} \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \Delta \\ M_1 \times M_2 & & \xrightarrow{\qquad\qquad d_0 \qquad\qquad} & & M_{12} \end{array}$$

where Δ is the codiagonal map, because $M_{12} \times M_{12} \cong M_{12} \oplus M_{12}$ since the category of finite dagger modules is equivalent to the category of finite modules. So, all the maps of the diagram are surjective by construction except for d_0, which is then necessarily surjective.

- Third step: We claim that the previous step is enough to prove the theorem for the covering $\mathscr{U}$. The proof of this step is identical to the classical proof of Kiehl theorem. We write here all the details for the convenience of the reader.

  So we claim that the fact that for any $\mathscr{U}$-coherent module one has $H^1(\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{F}) = 0$, implies that $\mathscr{F}$ is associated to a finite A-module. Here it is not necessary to make a difference between Laurent and more general admissible strict dagger affinoid coverings. Therefore, consider a covering $\mathscr{U} = \{U_i\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ of X consisting of dagger affinoid subdomains $U_i = \mathcal{M}(A_i) \subset X$. Since $\mathscr{F}$ is $\mathscr{U}$-coherent, $\mathscr{F}|_{U_i}$ is associated to a finite A_i-module M_i. Let's consider a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_x \subset A$ (where with x we denote the corresponding point $x \in \mathcal{M}(A)$) and denote by $\mathfrak{m}_x\mathcal{O}_X$ the associated coherent ideal sheaf of the structural sheaf $\mathcal{O}_X$. Its product with $\mathscr{F}$ yields a submodule $\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F} \subset \mathscr{F}$ which is $\mathscr{U}$-coherent, since its restriction to each U_i is associated to the submodule $\mathfrak{m}_x M_i \subset M_i$ which is finite, since M_i is a finite module over a Noetherian ring. Then $\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}$ is $\mathscr{U}$-coherent by proposition 6.1.18 and

  $$0 \to \mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F} \to 0$$

  is a short exact sequence of $\mathscr{U}$-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules. If $U' = \mathcal{M}(A')$ is a dagger affinoid subdomain of X which is contained in U_i for some index i, then the above short exact sequence restricts to a short exact sequence of coherent modules on U'. More precisely, as the modules $\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}$, $\mathscr{F}$, and $\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}$ are $\mathscr{U}$-coherent, their restrictions to U_i are associated to finite A_i-modules, and the same is true for restrictions to U' in terms of A'-modules. Thus, by proposition 6.1.18, the above short exact sequence leads to a short exact sequence of A'-modules

  $$0 \to \mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(U') \to \mathscr{F}(U') \to \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(U') \to 0.$$

  In particular, U' can be any intersection of sets in $\mathscr{U}$, and we thereby see that the canonical sequence of Cech complexes

  $$0 \to C^\bullet(\mathscr{U}, \mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}) \to C^\bullet(\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{F}) \to C^\bullet(\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}) \to 0$$

  is exact. As $H^1(U, \mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}) = 0$ by our assumption, the associated long cohomology sequence yields an exact sequence

  $$0 \to \mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(X) \to \mathscr{F}(X) \to \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(X) \to 0.$$

  Next we claim that the restriction homomorphism $\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(X) \to \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(U_j)$ is bijective for any index j such that $x \in U_j$. To justify the claim, consider a dagger

affinoid subdomain $U' = \mathcal{M}(A') \subset X$ such that $\mathscr{F}|_{U'}$ is associated to a finite A'-module M' and write $U' \cap U_j = \mathcal{M}(A'_j)$. Then $\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x|_{U'}$ is associated to the quotient $M'/\mathfrak{m}_x M'$, and the canonical map

$$M'/\mathfrak{m}_x M' \to (M'/\mathfrak{m}_x M') \otimes_A A'_j \to (M'/\mathfrak{m}_x M') \otimes_{A'/\mathfrak{m}_x A'} (A'_j/\mathfrak{m}_x A'_j)$$

is bijective for $x \in U_j$. This follows from proposition 3.5.5 if $x \in U' \cap U_j$, since the restriction map $A'/\mathfrak{m}_x A' \to A'_j/\mathfrak{m}_x A'_j$ is bijective then. However, the latter is also true for $x \notin U'$ since in this case the quotients $A'/\mathfrak{m}_x A'$ and $A'_j/\mathfrak{m}_x A'_j$ are trivial. Now, since $\mathscr{F}$ is $\mathscr{U}$-coherent, we look at the canonical diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
(\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F})(X) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i=1}^n (\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F})(U_i) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i,k}^n (\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F})(U_i \cap U_k) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
(\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F})(U_j) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i=1}^n (\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F})(U_i \cap U_j) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i,k}^n (\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F})(U_i \cap U_k \cap U_j)
\end{array}$$

with exact rows. By the consideration above, the middle and right restriction morphisms are bijective. Thus, the same will hold for the left one, which settles the (last) claim. To conclude, we look at the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathscr{F}(X) & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x(X) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
M_j = \mathscr{F}(U_j) & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x(U_j) = M_j/\mathfrak{m}_x M_j
\end{array}$$

for $x \in U_j$, the exact sequence $0 \to \mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(X) \to \mathscr{F}(X) \to \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(X) \to 0$ and the bijection $\mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(X) \to \mathscr{F}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathscr{F}(U_j)$ imply that $M_j/\mathfrak{m}_x M_j$, as an A_j-module, is generated by the image of $\mathscr{F}(X)$. Hence, by the classical lemma of Nakayama, $\mathscr{F}(X)$ generates M_j locally at each point $x \in U_j$. But then the submodule of M_j which is generated by the image of $\mathscr{F}(X)$ must coincide with M_j. Therefore we can choose elements $f_1, \ldots, f_s \in \mathscr{F}(X)$ such that their images generate all modules $M_i = \mathscr{F}(U_i)$ simultaneously for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. As a consequence, the morphism of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules $\phi : \mathcal{O}_X^s \to \mathscr{F}$ given by $f_1, \ldots, f_s$ is an epimorphism of $\mathscr{U}$-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules, and its kernel $\operatorname{Ker}\phi$ is a $\mathscr{U}$-coherent submodule of $\mathcal{O}_X^s$ by proposition 6.1.18. We can work now in the same way as before with $\operatorname{Ker}\phi$ in place of $\mathscr{F}$ and construct an epimorphism $\psi : \mathcal{O}_X^r \to \operatorname{Ker}\phi$, thus obtaining an exact sequence

$$\mathcal{O}_X^r \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{O}_X^s \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathscr{F} \to 0$$

of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules. Thereby we see that $\mathscr{F}$ is isomorphic to the cokernel of ψ, and so $\mathscr{F}$ is associated to the cokernel of the A-module morphism $\widetilde{\psi} : A^r \to A^s$ by proposition 6.1.18. The latter is finite and, hence, $\mathscr{F}$ is associated to a finite A-module. This finishes the proof of the third step and also the proof of theorem.

□

Corollary 6.1.22. *A sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules over a k-dagger affinoid space is coherent if and only if is $\mathscr{U}$-coherent for a dagger affinoid covering of X.*

Proof. □

Corollary 6.1.23. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra and $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$. Then an $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules is coherent if and only if is associated to a finite A-dagger module.*

Proof. The non-strict case is easily reduced to the strict case. □

Definition 6.1.24. *Let $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Coh}_W(\mathcal{M}(A)))$, then we define the* support *of $\mathscr{F}$ to be*

$$\mathrm{Supp}\,(\mathscr{F}) \doteq \{x \in \mathcal{M}(A) | \mathscr{F}_x \neq 0\}.$$

Definition 6.1.25. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra. A closed subset $U \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ is called* special *if it's a finite union of k-dagger affinoid subdomains.*

So, on $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ we can consider the *special* G-topology whose admissible open subsets are given by special subsets and whose coverings coincides with the coverings of the weak G-topology of X.

Definition 6.1.26. *Let A be a k-dagger affinoid algebra and $V \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ a special subset. Given a finite covering $V_1, \ldots, V_n \subset V$ of V by dagger affinoid subdomains we define*

$$A_V \doteq \mathrm{Ker}\left(\prod_i A_{V_i} \to \prod_{i,j} A_{V_i \cap V_j}\right).$$

Proposition 6.1.27. *Let $V \subset \mathcal{M}(A) = X$ be a special subsets, then*

1. *A_V doesn't depend on the choice of the dagger affinoid covering of V;*
2. *the correspondence $V \mapsto A_V$ is a sheaf for the special G-topology;*
3. *V is a dagger subdomain if and only if A_V is a k-dagger affinoid algebra and there is a canonical homeomorphism $\mathcal{M}(A_V) \cong V$.*

Proof. 1. Let $\{V_i\}$ and $\{W_i\}$ two coverings of V by dagger affinoid subdomains. By Tate acyclicity, both Cech complexes

$$0 \to A_V \to \prod_i A_{V_i} \to \prod_{i,j} A_{V_i \cap V_j} \to \ldots$$

and

$$0 \to A'_V \to \prod_i A_{W_i} \to \prod_{i,j} A_{W_i \cap W_j} \to \ldots$$

are acyclic, hence by simple homological algebra and considering the covering $\{V_i\} \cup \{W_i\}$ one can see that $A_V \cong A'_V$.

2. The family of coverings for the special G-topology and for the weak G-topology of dagger affinoid subdomains are equal.

3. The direct implication is in the definition of dagger subdomain. For the converse, let's cover A_V with a finite covering of rational subdomains (we can always do it by our generalization of Gerritzen-Grauert theorem), let's call this rational subdomains

$$V_i = X\left(\frac{\overline{f}_i}{g_i}\right), i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

We have a canonical morphism

$$A \to \prod_i A_{V_i}$$

which is clearly in the kernel of

$$\prod_i A_{V_i} \to \prod_{i,j} A_{V_i \cap V_j},$$

hence there exists a unique map $\alpha : A \to A_V$ and so let's suppose that this map identifies $\mathcal{M}(A_V)$ with the subspace $V \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$. Now, given any affinoid map $\beta : A \to B$ such that $\mathrm{Im}\,(\mathcal{M}(B)) \subset V$, then there is a unique continuous map $\gamma^* : \mathcal{M}(B) \to \mathcal{M}(A_V)$ for which the following diagram



commutes. We have to show that this map is induced by in affinoid map γ. Let $1 \leqslant i_1, \ldots, i_m \leqslant n$ be the indexes such that g_i doesn't vanish in V. Then $A[g_{i_1}^{-1}, \ldots, g_{i_1}^{-1}] \hookrightarrow A_V$ and is dense. Moreover, $\beta(g_i)$ is also a unit in $\mathcal{M}(B)$ hence we can map any element of A_V to a unique element of B by an affinoid map which naturally 'extends' β. This is the required map representing γ^*.

□

6.2 Dagger analytic spaces

Let's address now the problem of constructing the full category of dagger analytic spaces over a valued field. We start by recalling the properties of Berkovich nets that we will use to build our global analytic spaces. We will follow very closely the discussion of the first section of [30], checking that all the main results can be translated in out in our settings with minor changes in some proves.

Notation 6.2.1. Let X be a set, $\tau \subset \mathscr{P}(X)$ a collection of subset of X and $Y \subset X$, we write

$$\tau|_Y \doteq \{V \in \tau | V \subset Y\}$$

and call it the *restriction* of τ to Y.

Definition 6.2.2. *Let X be a topological space and $\tau \subset \mathscr{P}(X)$ we say that:*

1. *τ is* dense *if for any $V \in \tau$ each point $x \in V$ has a neighborhood basis of elements of $\tau|_V$;*
2. *τ is a* quasi-net on X *if for any $x \in X$ there exists $V_1, \cdots, V_n \in \tau$ such that $x \in V_1 \cap \cdots \cap V_n$ and $V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_n$ is a neighborhood of x;*
3. *τ is a* net on X *(or better a* Berkovich net*) if τ is a quasi-net and for any $U, V \in \tau$ the collection $\tau|_{U \cap V}$ is a quasi-net on $U \cap V$.*

Proposition 6.2.3. *Let τ be a quasi-net on X then*

1. *a subset $U \subset X$ is open if and only if for any $V \in \tau$ the subset $U \cap V$ is open in V;*
2. *if every element of τ is compact, then X is Hausdorff if and only for any $U, V \in \tau$ the intersection $U \cap V$ is compact.*

Proof. [30] □

Proposition 6.2.4. *Let τ be a net of compact subsets on X then*

1. *for any $U, V \in \tau$ the intersection $U \cap V$ is locally closed in U and V;*

2. if $V \subset V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_n$ for $V, V_1, \cdots, V_n \in \tau$ then there exist $U_1, ..., U_m \in \tau$ such that

$$V = U_1 \cup \cdots \cup U_m$$

and $U_i \subset V_{j_i}$ for any $i \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ and $j_i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$.

Proof. [30] □

Definition 6.2.5. *Let X be a locally Hausdorff topological space. A k-dagger affinoid atlas on X is the data consisting of a net τ on X such that to each $V \in \tau$ there is assigned a k-dagger affinoid algebra A_V and a homeomorphism $V \cong \mathcal{M}(A_V)$ such that if $V' \in \tau$ and $V' \subset V$ we assign a map $\alpha_{V/V'} : A_V \to A_{V'}$ which is the dagger affinoid subdomain embedding of V' in V.*

The triple (X, A, τ) is a k-dagger analytic space. *If all A_V are strict k-dagger algebras then this triple is called a strictly k-dagger analytic space.*

By propositions 3.4.6 and 5.1.27 each point of a dagger affinoid space has a fundamental system of open arcwise connected subsets that are countable at infinity. It follows that a basis of topology of a k-dagger analytic space is formed by open locally compact paracompact arcwise connected subsets.

Lemma 6.2.6. *Let (X, A, τ) be a k-dagger analytic space. If W is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain in some $U \in \tau$, then it is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain in any $V \in \tau$ that contains W.*

Proof. Since $\tau|_{U \cap V}$ is a quasi-net and W is compact, we can find $U_1, \ldots, U_n \in \tau|_{U \cap V}$ with $W \subset U_1 \cup \ldots \cup U_n$. Furthermore, since W and U_i, are dagger affinoid subdomains in U, then $W_i \doteq W \cap U_i$ and $W_i \cap W_j$ are dagger affinoid subdomain in U_i and so also in V. By Tate's Acyclicity Theorem, applied to the dagger affinoid covering $\{W_i\}$ of W the bornological algebra

$$A_W = \mathrm{Ker}\,(\prod_i A_{W_i} \to \prod_{i,j} A_{W_i \cap W_j})$$

is k-dagger affinoid and $W \cong \mathcal{M}(A_W)$, so W is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain in V by proposition 6.1.27. □

Definition 6.2.7. *Let (X, A, τ) be a k-dagger analytic space, with $\overline{\tau}$ we denote the family of all W such that W is a k-dagger affinoid subdomain in some $V \in \tau$. Then, $\overline{\tau}$ is a dense net in X. We call $\overline{\tau}$ the* completion *of the net τ.*

Proposition 6.2.8. *Let (X, A, τ) be a k-dagger analytic space. The family $\overline{\tau}$ is a net on X, and there exists a unique (up to a canonical isomorphism) dagger affinoid atlas $\overline{A}$ with the net $\overline{\tau}$ that extends τ.*

Proof. The proof is identical to [30], proposition 1.2.6. □

Definition 6.2.9. *A* strong morphism *of k-dagger analytic spaces $\phi : (X, A, \tau) \to (X', A', \tau')$ consists of a continuous map $\phi : X \to X'$, such that for each $V \in \tau$ there exists $V' \in \tau'$ with $\phi(V) \subset V'$, and for any such pair (V, V') a system of compatible (with respect to atlases) morphisms of k-dagger affinoid spaces $\phi_{V/V'} : (V, A_V) \to (V', A_{V'})$.*

Proposition 6.2.10. *Any strong morphism $\phi : (X, A, \tau) \to (X', A', \tau')$ induces in a unique way to a strong morphism $\overline{\phi} : (X, A, \overline{\tau}) \to (X', A', \overline{\tau}')$.*

Proof. Let U and U' be dagger affinoid subdomains in $V \in \tau$ and $V' \in \tau'$, respectively, and suppose that $\phi(U) \subset U'$. Take $W' \in \tau'$ with $\phi(V) \subset W'$. Then $\phi(U) \subset W_1 \cup \ldots \cup W_n$ for some $W_1, \ldots, W_n \in \tau'|_{V' \cap W'}$, because $\phi(U)$ is compact. The morphism of dagger affinoid spaces $\phi_{V/W'}$ induces a morphism $V_i \doteq \phi^{-1}_{V/W'}(W_i) \to W_i$ that induces, in its turn, a morphism of dagger affinoid spaces $U_i \doteq U \cap V_i \to U'$. Thus, we have morphisms of dagger affinoid spaces $U_i \to U \to U'$ that are compatible on intersections. So they gives rise to a system of morphisms of dagger affinoid spaces $\overline{\phi}_{U/U'} : (U, A_U) \to (U', A_{U'})$ which are clearly compatible, showing that we can extend ϕ to the morphism $\overline{\phi}$. □

The composition of two strong morphisms ϕ and ψ is simply the composition of the underlying continuous map and of the system of dagger affinoid maps, which can always be arranged in a compatible way by passing to the maps $\overline{\phi}$ and $\overline{\psi}$ canonically induced by ϕ and ψ by previous proposition.

The category of k-dagger analytic spaces with strong morphisms is denoted by $\widetilde{\mathbf{An}}^{\dagger}_k$.

Definition 6.2.11. *A strong morphism $\phi : (X, A, \tau) \to (X', A', \tau')$ is said to be a* quasi-isomorphism *if ϕ induces a homeomorphism between X and X' and, for any pair $V \in \tau$ and $V' \in \tau'$ with $\phi(V) \subset V'$, ϕ identifies V with a dagger affinoid subdomain in V'.*

It is easy to see that if ϕ is a quasi-isomorphism, then so is $\overline{\phi}$. The following easy lemma is needed to show that the system of quasi-isomorphisms admits calculus of fractions.

Lemma 6.2.12. *Let $\phi : (X, A, \tau) \to (X', A', \tau')$ be a strong morphism. Then for any pair $V \in \overline{\tau}$ and $V' \in \overline{\tau}'$ the intersection $V \cap \phi^{-1}(V')$ is a finite union of k-dagger affinoid subdomains in V.*

Proof. Take $U' \in \overline{\tau}'$ with $\phi(V) \subset U'$. Then we can find $U'_1, \ldots, U'_n \in \tau'|_{U' \cap V'}$ such that $\phi(V) \subset U'_1 \cup \cdots \cup U'_n$, and

$$V \cap \phi^{-1}(V') = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \phi^{-1}_{V/U'}(U'_i).$$

□

Proposition 6.2.13. *The system of quasi-isomorphisms in $\widetilde{\mathbf{An}}^{\dagger}_k$ admits calculus of right fractions.*

Proof. We have to verify that the system of quasi-isomorphisms satisfies the following properties:

1. all identity morphisms are quasi-isomorphisms;
2. the composition of two quasi-isomorphisms is a quasi-isomorphism;
3. any diagram of the form $(X, A, \tau) \xrightarrow{\phi} (X', A', \tau') \xleftarrow{g} (X'', A'', \tau'')$, where g is a quasi-isomorphism, can be complemented to a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X, A, \tau) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & (X', A', \tau') \\ {\scriptstyle f}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ (X''', A''', \tau''') & \longrightarrow & (X'', A'', \tau'') \end{array}$$

where f is a quasi-isomorphism;

4. if for two strong morphisms $\phi, \psi : (X, A, \tau) \to (X', A', \tau')$ and for a quasi-isomorphism $g : (X', A', \tau') \to (X'', A'', \tau'')$ one has $g \circ \phi = g \circ \psi$, then there exists a quasi-isomorphism $f : (X''', A''', \tau''') \to (X, A, \tau)$ with $\phi \circ f = \psi \circ f$. (We'll show, in fact, that in this situation $\phi = \psi$).

The property 1. is clearly valid. To verify 2. it suffices to apply the definition of the composition and the third point of proposition 6.1.27. Suppose then, that we have a diagram as in 3., we may assume that $X' = X''$ and then $\tau'' \subset \tau'$. Let τ''' denote the family of all $V \in \overline{\tau}$ for which there exists $V'' \in \tau''$ with $\phi(V) \subset V''$. By the previous lemma it follows that τ''' is a net on X. We can attach to τ''' a k-affinoid atlas by restricting the dagger affinoid atlas $\overline{\tau}$ and the strong morphism $\overline{\phi}$ induces a strong morphism $\sigma : (X, A''', \tau''') \to (X, A', \tau')$. Then σ factors through the canonical quasi-isomorphism $(X, A''', \tau''') \to (X, A, \tau)$, obtaining the required property 3.

Finally, we claim that in the situation 4. the morphisms ϕ and ψ coincide. First of all, is clear that the underlying maps of topological spaces coincide. Furthermore, let $V \in \tau$ and $V' \in \tau'$ be such that $\phi(V) \subset V'$. Take $V'' \in \tau''$ with $g(V') \subset V''$. Then we have two morphisms k-dagger affinoid spaces $\phi_{V/V'}, \psi_{V/V'} : V \to V'$ such that their compositions with $g_{V'/V''}$ coincide. Since V' is a dagger affinoid domain in V'', it follows that $\phi_{V/V'} = \psi_{V/V'}$. □

Definition 6.2.14. *Let (X, A, τ) be a k-dagger analytic space. If σ is a net on X, we write $\sigma < \tau$ if $\sigma \subset \overline{\tau}$ and we says that σ is* finer *then τ.*

Cleary the system of nets $\{\sigma\} \subset \mathscr{P}(X)$ such that $\sigma < \overline{\tau}$ is filtered and there is a canonical quasi-isomorphism

$$(X, A_\sigma, \sigma) \to (X, \overline{A}, \overline{\tau})$$

where A_σ is the canonical restriction of $\overline{A}$ to σ.

Definition 6.2.15. *The category obtained by inverting quasi-isomorphisms of $\widetilde{\mathbf{An}}_k^\dagger$ is denoted $\mathbf{An}_k^\dagger$ and is called the* category of k-dagger analytic spaces.

Clearly, the category of k-dagger affinoid spaces embeds faithfully in $\mathbf{An}_k^\dagger$. So, we can state the following corollary to the previous proposition, which is simply a more concise way to express how the localization we just defined acts.

Corollary 6.2.16. *Let $(X, A, \tau), (X', A', \tau')$ be two k-dagger analytic spaces, then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{An}_k^\dagger}((X, A, \tau), (X', A', \tau')) = \varinjlim_{\sigma < \tau} \mathrm{Hom}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{An}}_k^\dagger}((X, A_\sigma, \sigma), (X', A', \tau')).$$

Proof. See [49] where is shown that to the deduce the previous formula one only needs that the system of morphisms to invert satisfies only calculus of right fractions. □

Now, to continue our study of k-dagger analytic spaces we need to substitute the concept of k-dagger affinoid subdomain with something more general.

Definition 6.2.17. *Let (X, A, τ) be a k-dagger analytic space. We say that a subset $W \subset X$ is* τ-special *if it is compact and there exists a covering $W = W_1 \cup \ldots \cup W_n$ such that $W_i, W_i \cap W_j \in \tau$, for all i, j, and*

$$A_{W_i} \otimes_k^\dagger A_{W_j} \to A_{W_i \cap W_j}$$

is a strict epimorphism, for all i, j. A covering of W of the above type is said to be a τ-special covering *of W.*

Proposition 6.2.18. *Let W be a τ-special subset of (X, A, τ). If $U, V \in \tau|_W$, then $U \cap V \in \overline{\tau}$ and*

$$A_U \otimes_k^\dagger A_V \to A_{U\cap V}$$

is a strict epimorphism.

Proof. Let's take a cover $\{W_i\}$ of W as above, *i.e.* a τ-special covering. Since the subsets $U \cap W_i$, and $V \cap W_i$, are compact for any i, we can find finite coverings $\{U_{i,k}\}$ of $U \cap W_i$, and $\{V_{i,k}\}$ of $V \cap W_i$, by subsets from τ. Furthermore, since $W_i \cap W_j \to W_i \times W_j$, are closed immersions, is follows that $U_{i,k} \cap V_{j,l} \in \overline{\tau}$ and $U_{i,k} \cap V_{j,l} \to U_{i,k} \times V_{j,l}$ is a closed immersion. Consider now the finite dagger affinoid covering $\{U_{i,k} \times V_{j,l}\}$ of the dagger affinoid space $U \times V$. For each quadruplet i, j, k, l, $A_{U_{i,k}\cap V_{j,l}}$ is a finite $A_{U_{i,k}\times V_{j,l}}$-algebra, and the system $\{A_{U_{i,k}\cap V_{j,l}}\}$ satisfies the condition of Kiehl's Theorem applied to the k-dagger affinoid space $U \times V$. It follows that this system is defined by a finite $A_{U\times V}$-algebra isomorphic to

$$A_{U\cap V} \doteq \mathrm{Ker}\,(\prod A_{U_{i,k}\cap V_{j,l}} \to \prod A_{U_{i,k}\cap V_{j,l}\cap U_{i',k'}\cap V_{j',l'}}),$$

and therefore the latter algebra is k-dagger affinoid (by proposition 3.2.21), and since $\mathcal{M}(A_{U\cap V}) \cong U \cap V$ we see that $U \cap V$ is a dagger affinoid subdomain in U and V *i.e.* , $U \cap V \in \overline{\tau}$ □

Corollary 6.2.19. *Let W be a τ-special subset of X, then any finite covering of W by subsets from τ is a τ-special covering.*

Definition 6.2.20. *Let (X, A, τ) be a k-dagger analytic space. We denote by $\widehat{\tau}$ the set of $\overline{\tau}$-special subsets such that the algebra*

$$A_W \doteq \mathrm{Ker}\,\left(\prod A_{W_i} \to \prod A_{W_i\cap W_j}\right),$$

for a $\overline{\tau}$-special covering $\{W_i\}$ (A_W doesn't depends on the covering), satisfies the following conditions:

1. *A_W is a k-dagger affinoid algebra;*
2. *$\mathcal{M}(A_W) \cong W$;*
3. *the k-dagger affinoid spaces (W_i, A_{W_i}) defines k-dagger affinoid subdomains in $(\mathcal{M}(A_W), A_W)$.*

We call $\widehat{\tau}$ the specialization *of the net τ.*

Proposition 6.2.21. *Let (X, A, τ) be a k-dagger analytic space, then*

1. *the collection $\widehat{\tau}$ is a net;*
2. *for any net σ such that $\sigma < \tau$ one has $\widehat{\sigma} = \widehat{\tau}$;*
3. *there exists a unique (up to a canonical isomorphism) dagger analytic atlas $\widehat{A}$ with the net $\widehat{\tau}$ that extends the atlas A;*
4. *$\widehat{\widehat{\tau}} = \widehat{\tau}$.*

Proof.

1. Let $U, V \in \tau$ and take $\overline{\tau}$-special coverings $\{U_i\}$ of U and $\{V_j\}$ of V. Since $U \cap V = \bigcup(U_i \cap V_j)$ and $\overline{\tau}|_{U_i\cap V_j}$ are quasinets, it follows that $\widehat{\tau}|_{U\cap V}$ is a quasinet;
2. Let σ be a net with $\sigma < \tau$. By previous proposition, to verify the equality $\widehat{\sigma} = \widehat{\tau}$, it suffices to show that for any $V \in \overline{\tau}$ there exist $U_1, \ldots, U_n \in \overline{\sigma}$ with $V = U_1 \cup \ldots \cup U_n$. Since σ is a net on X, we can find $W_1, \ldots, W_n \in \sigma$ with $V \subset W_1 \cup \ldots \cup W_n$. Since $V, W_i \in \overline{\tau}$ and $\overline{\tau}$ is a net we can find $U_1, \ldots, U_n \in \overline{\tau}$ such that $V = U_1 \cup \ldots \cup U_n$ and each U_i is contained in some W_j. Finally, since $W_j \in \sigma$, it follows that $U_i \in \overline{\sigma}$.

3. For each $V \in \widehat{\tau}$ we fix a $\overline{\tau}$-special covering $\{V_i\}$ and assign to V the algebra A_V and the homeomorphism $\mathcal{M}(A_V) \cong V$ arising from the covering. Then, we have to construct for each $U \in \widehat{\tau}$ with $U \subset V$ a canonical bounded homomorphism $A_V \to A_U$ that identifies (U, A_U) with a dagger affinoid subdomain in (V, A_V). Consider first the case when $U \in \tau$. By previous proposition, $U \cap V_i$ is a dagger affinoid subdomain in V_i and therefore in V. It follows that U is a dagger affinoid subdomain in V. If U is arbitrary, then by the first case each U_i from some $\overline{\tau}$-special covering of U is a dagger affinoid subdomain in V. It follows that U is a dagger affinoid domain in V.

4. From previous proposition it follows that $\overline{\widehat{\tau}} = \widehat{\tau}$. Let $\{V_i\}$ be a $\widehat{\tau}$-special covering of some $V \in \widehat{\widehat{\tau}}$. For each i we take a $\overline{\tau}$-special covering $\{V_{i,j}\}$, of V_i. Then $\{V_{i,j}\}$, is a $\overline{\tau}$-special covering of V, and therefore $V \in \widehat{\tau}$.

□

Definition 6.2.22. *Let (X, A, τ) be a k-dagger analytic space. The subsets of X which are in $\widehat{\tau}$ are said to be* k-dagger affinoid domains *in X.*

Definition 6.2.23. *We say that a k-dagger analytic space (X, A, τ) is* good *if for each point $x \in X$ there is a k-dagger affinoid domain which is neighborhood of x.*

Now we want to study the way to glue these dagger analytic spaces, to put a structural sheaf over them and to study the relations between the weak G-topology induced by k-dagger affinoid domains of an analytic space and its 'true' topology. The key definition to do this is the following. From now on we often suppress the explicit reference to the net τ and the atlas A of a dagger analytic space supposing to work always with its maximal atlas given by $\widehat{\tau}$.

Definition 6.2.24. *A subset Y of a k-dagger analytic space (X, A, τ) is said to be a* k-dagger analytic domain *if, for any point $x \in Y$, there exist k-dagger affinoid domains $V_1, \ldots, V_n \in \widehat{\tau}$ that are contained in Y and such that $x \in V_1 \cap \ldots \cap V_n$ and the set $V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_n$ is a neighborhood of $x \in Y$ (*i.e. *, the restriction of the net affinoid domains on Y is a net on Y).*

We remark that the intersection of two dagger analytic domains is a dagger analytic domain, and the preimage of a dagger analytic domain with respect to a morphism of a dagger analytic spaces is a dagger analytic domain. Furthermore, the family of dagger affinoid domains that are contained in a dagger analytic domain $Y \subset X$ defines a dagger affinoid atlas on Y, and there is a canonical morphism of dagger analytic spaces $\iota : Y \to X$. For any morphism $\phi : Z \to X$ with $\phi(Z) \subset Y$ there exists a unique morphism $\psi : Z \to Y$ with $\phi = \iota \circ \psi$. A morphism $\phi : Y \to X$ that induces an isomorphism of Y with a dagger analytic domain in X is said to be an *open immersion*, also if Y may not be open in the topology of X. We remark also that then all open subsets of X are dagger analytic domains.

Is clear that a dagger analytic domain that is isomorphic to a k-dagger affinoid space is a k-dagger affinoid domain.

Proposition 6.2.25. *Let $\{Y_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a covering of a k-dagger analytic space (X, A, τ) by dagger analytic domains such that each point of $x \in X$ has a neighborhood of the form $Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_n$, with $x \in Y_1 \cap \ldots Y_n$ (*i.e. *, $\{Y_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a quasinet on X). Then for any dagger analytic space X' the following sequence of sets is exact*

$$\mathrm{Hom}\,(X, X') \to \prod_{i \in I} \mathrm{Hom}\,(Y_i, X') \to \prod_{i,j \in I} \mathrm{Hom}\,(Y_i \cap Y_j, X').$$

Proof. Let $\phi_i : Y_i \to X'$ be a family of morphisms such that, for all pairs $i, j \in I$, $\phi_i|_{Y_i \cap Y_j} = \phi_j|_{Y_i \cap Y_j}$. Then these ϕ_i, define a map $X \to X'$ which is continuous. Furthermore, let σ be the collection of dagger affinoid domains $V \subset X$ such that there exist $i \in I$ and a dagger affinoid domain $V' \subset X'$ with $V \subset Y_i$, and $\phi(V) \subset V'$. σ is a net on X and $\sigma < \tau$, therefore there is a morphism $\phi : X \to X'$ that gives rise to all the morphisms ϕ_i, by the way we defined morphism of dagger analytic spaces.

□

We now study some ways of gluing k-dagger analytic spaces. Let $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of k-dagger analytic spaces, and suppose that, for each pair $i, j \in I$, we are given dagger analytic domains $X_{i,j} \subset X_i$ and an isomorphism of k-dagger analytic spaces $\phi_{i,j} : X_{i,j} \to X_{j,i}$ so that $X_{i,i} = X_i$, $\phi_{i,j}(X_{i,j} \cap X_{i,l}) = X_{j,i} \cap X_{j,l}$ and $\phi_{i,l} = \phi_{j,l} \circ \phi_{i,j}$ on $X_{i,j} \cap X_{i,l}$, for any $i, j, l \in I$. We are looking for a k-dagger analytic space X with a family of morphisms $\mu_i : X_i \to X$ such that:

1. μ_i is an isomorphism of X_i with a k-dagger analytic domain in X;
2. the family $\{\mu_i(X_i)\}_{i \in I}$ covers X;
3. $\mu_i(X_{i,j}) = \mu_i(X_i) \cap \mu_j(X_j)$;
4. $\mu_i = \mu_j \circ \phi_{i,j}$ on $X_{i,j}$.

If such X exists, we say that it is obtained by *gluing X_i along $X_{i,j}$*.

Proposition 6.2.26. *The space X obtained by gluing X_i along $X_{i,j}$ exists and is unique (up to a canonical isomorphism) in each of the following cases:*

1. *all $X_{i,j}$ are open in X_i;*
2. *for any $i \in I$, all $X_{i,j}$ are closed in X_i and the number of $j \in I$ with $X_{i,j} \neq \varnothing$ is finite.*

Furthermore, in the case 1) all $\mu_i(X_{i,j})$ are open in X. In the case 2) all $\mu_i(X_{i,j})$ are closed in X and, if all X_i, are Hausdorff (resp. paracompact), then X is Hausdorff (resp. paracompact).

Proof. Let $\widetilde{X}$ be the disjoint union $\coprod_i X_i$. The system $\{\phi_{i,j}\}$ defines an equivalence relation R on $\widetilde{X}$. We denote by X the quotient space $\widetilde{X}/R$ and by $\mu_i : X_i \to X$ the induced maps. In the case 1. the equivalence relation R is open, and therefore all $\mu_i(X_i)$ are open in X. In the case 2., the equivalence relation R is closed, and therefore all $\mu_i(X_i)$ are closed in X and μ_i induces a homeomorphism $X_i \to \mu_i(X_i)$. Moreover, if all X_i, are Hausdorff, then X is Hausdorff. If all X_i are paracompact, then X is paracompact because it has a locally finite covering by closed paracompact subsets. Furthermore, let τ denote the collection of all subsets $V \subset X$ for which there exists $i \in I$ such that $V \subset \mu_i(X_i)$ and $\mu_i^{-1}(V)$ is a k-dagger affinoid domain in X_i (in this case $\mu_j^{-1}(V)$ is a k-dagger affinoid domain in X_j, for any j with $V \subset \mu_j(X_j)$). It is easy to see that τ is a net, and there is an evident k-dagger affinoid atlas A with this net. In this way we get a k-dagger analytic space (X, A, τ) that satisfies the properties 1.-4. above. That X is unique up to canonical isomorphism follows from proposition 6.2.25. □

Definition 6.2.27. *Let X be a k-dagger analytic space. The family of its dagger analytic domains can be considered as a category, which can be equipped of a Grothendieck topology generated by the pretopology for which the set of coverings of a dagger analytic domain $Y \subset X$ is formed by the families $\{Y_i\}$ of analytic domains in Y that are quasinets on Y. For brevity, the above Grothendieck topology is called the* G-topology on X, *and the corresponding site is denoted by X_G.*

From Proposition 6.2.25 it follows that any representable presheaf on X_G is a sheaf.

Definition 6.2.28. *We define the n-dimensional affine space $\mathbb{A}^n_k$ over k as the spectrum of the Fréchet algebra*

$$\mathbb{A}^n_k = \mathcal{M}(\varprojlim_{\rho\to\infty} W^n_k(\rho)) \cong \varinjlim_{\rho\to\infty} \mathcal{M}(W^n_k(\rho))$$

equipped with its canonical k-dagger analytic space structure.

To see that indeed $\varprojlim_{\rho\to\infty} W^n_k(\rho)$ is a Fréchet algebra we can do the same reasoning of proposition 5.1.15). The family of all closed polydisks centered in zero in $\mathbb{A}^n_k$, with their canonical k-dagger structure defines on $\mathbb{A}^n_k$ a k-dagger affinoid atlas, with respect which $\mathbb{A}^n_k$ is a good analytic space. Moreover, $\mathbb{A}^1_k$ is a ring object in the category of k-dagger analytic spaces, and we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.2.29. *Let $(A, \mathcal{M}(A))$ be a k-dagger affinoid space equipped with its canonical structure of k-dagger analytic space, then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{An}^\dagger_k}(\mathcal{M}(A), \mathbb{A}^1_k) \cong A.$$

Proof. By the universal property of $W^n_k(\rho)$ we see that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{An}^\dagger_k}(\mathcal{M}(A), \mathbb{A}^1_k) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{An}^\dagger_k}(\mathcal{M}(A), \varinjlim_{\rho\to\infty} \mathcal{M}(W^n_k(\rho))) =$$

$$= \varinjlim_{\rho\to\infty} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{An}^\dagger_k}(\mathcal{M}(A), \mathcal{M}(W^n_k(\rho))) = A$$

because

$$A = \varinjlim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho A^\circ$$

follows by the spectral characterization of weakly power-boundedness. □

So, by applying proposition 6.2.25, we can give the following definition of the structural sheaf of a k-dagger analytic space.

Definition 6.2.30. *Let $X \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{An}^\dagger_k)$ we define $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}$,* the structural sheaf of X for the G-topology*, as the sheaf*

$$U \mapsto \mathcal{O}_{X_G}(U) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{An}^\dagger_k}(U, \mathbb{A}^1_k)$$

for any dagger analytic domain of X.

Remark 6.2.31. In the complex analytic case it's clear that this definition agree with the classical definition of structural sheaf and in fact extends naturally it (we will see below how to embed the category of classical complex analytic spaces in the category of $\mathbb{C}$-dagger analytic spaces). Since any open set of a dagger analytic space X is a dagger analytic domain, we have that the structural sheaf just defined gives the association

$$U \mapsto \mathcal{O}_{X_G}(U) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{An}^\dagger_{\mathbb{C}}}(U, \mathbb{C})$$

for any open set in X, *i.e.* is precisely the structural sheaf of complex analytic geometry.

Remark 6.2.32. We also remark that if (X, A, τ) is a Berkovich analytic space over k such that every affinoid algebra A_U for $U \in \tau$ can be written as

$$A_U \cong \frac{T^{n_U}_k(\rho)}{(f^U_1, \ldots, f^U_n)}$$

with $n_U \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_1^U, \dots, f_n^U \in T_k^{n_U}$ overconvergent analytic functions on the disk $\mathcal{M}(T_k^{n_U}(\rho))$. Then we can associate to A_U canonically a dagger algebra $A_U^\dagger$ and hence to A canonically an atlas $A^\dagger$ of dagger algebras. In this way we can associate to (X, A, τ) the k-dagger analytic space $(X, A^\dagger, \tau)$, we will say more on this topic later. What we want to underline now is that for any open set $V \subset X$ we get the canonical isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{An}_k^\dagger}(U, \mathbb{A}_k^1) \cong \mathcal{O}_{X_G}^{\mathrm{Ber}}(U)$$

of Fréchet algebras, where $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}^{\mathrm{Ber}}(U)$ is the structural sheaf of (X, A, τ) as defined in [30].

6.3 Sheaves over dagger analytic spaces

Let X be a k-dagger analytic space. The category of $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}$-modules over X_G is denoted by $\mathbf{Mod}(X_G)$.

Definition 6.3.1. *An object $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Mod}(X_G))$ is said to be* coherent *if there exists a quasinet τ of k-dagger affinoid domains in X such that, for each $V \in \tau$, $\mathscr{F}|_{V_G}$ is isomorphic to the cokernel of a homomorphism of free $\mathcal{O}_{V_G}$-modules of finite rank. The category of $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}$-modules over X_G is denoted by $\mathbf{Coh}(X_G)$.*

By Kiehl theorem this is equivalent to require that for the given quasinet τ of k-dagger affinoid domains in X the restriction $\mathscr{F}|_{V_G}$, for $V \in \tau$ is associtated to a finite $\mathcal{O}_{V_G}(V)$-module.

Definition 6.3.2. *For any object $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Coh}(X_G))$ we define the* support *of $\mathscr{F}$ as the set*

$$\mathrm{Supp}\,(\mathscr{F}) \doteq \{x \in X | \mathscr{F}_x \neq 0\}.$$

Moreover, for any ideal sheaf $\mathscr{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_{X_G}$ the variety *of $\mathscr{I}$ is defined*

$$V(\mathscr{I}) \doteq \mathrm{Supp}\left(\frac{\mathcal{O}_{X_G}}{\mathscr{I}}\right).$$

Definition 6.3.3. *Keeping the same notation, we define $\mathbf{Pic}(X_G)$ to be the class of invertible sheaves on X_G and call it* the Picard group *of X_G, equipping it with the multiplication given by the tensor product of sheaves.*

We notice that $\mathbf{Pic}(X_G) \cong H^1(X_G, \mathcal{O}_{X_G}^\times)$, by a general result on G-ringed spaces, [50] exercise III.4.5.

Since, as we already remarked, every open subset of X is a k-dagger analytic domain, then the obvious projection map

$$\pi : X_G \to X$$

is a morphism of G-topological spaces, and so we get the following morphism of topoi. The direct image functor is simply the restriction *i.e.* for any presheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on X_G and any open suubset U we have that

$$(\pi_* \mathscr{F})(U) = \mathscr{F}(U).$$

In particular we can in this way equip canonically X with the structural sheaf

$$\mathcal{O}_X \doteq \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_{X_G})$$

which turn out to give to $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ the structure of a locally ringed space. And the inverse image functor is defined

$$(\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F})(U) = \varinjlim_{V \supset U} \mathscr{F}(V).$$

for any presheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on X, where the direct limit is taken on the open neighborhoods of U for any k-dagger analytic domain U of X.

Proposition 6.3.4. *The couple $\overline{\pi} = (\pi_*, \pi^{-1}) : \widetilde{X}_G \to \widetilde{X}$ defines a morphism of topoi, moreover for any sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on X we have that $\mathscr{F} \cong \pi_*\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}$, so in particular π^{-1} is fully faithful.*

Proof. First we notice that the relation $\mathscr{F} \cong \pi_*\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}$ follows easily form the definitions because for any open set $U \subset X$

$$(\pi_*\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F})(U) = \varinjlim_{V \supset U} \mathscr{F}(U) = \mathscr{F}(U)$$

where $V \subset U$ runs through the open neighborhood of U, but U is an open neighborhood of itself. Then we have to check that (π_*, π^{-1}) is an adjoint pair of functors. Let $\phi : \pi^{-1}\mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{G}$ be a morphism of sheaves on X_G, then this induces a morphism

$$\pi_*\phi : \pi_*\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F} \cong \mathscr{F} \to \pi_*\mathscr{G}.$$

On the other hand given a morphism $\phi : \mathscr{F} \to \pi_*\mathscr{G}$, this induces a morphism

$$\pi^{-1}\phi : \pi^*\mathscr{F} \to \pi^{-1}\pi_*\mathscr{G}.$$

Let now $U \subset X$ be an admissible open in X_G then we have a canonical map

$$(\pi^{-1}\pi_*)\mathscr{G}(U) = \varinjlim_{V \subset U} \mathscr{G}(V) \to \mathscr{G}(U)$$

obtained taking the limit map of the restriction maps $\mathscr{G}(V) \to \mathscr{G}(U)$. This system of maps gives a canonical morphism of sheaves $\pi^{-1}\pi_*\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{G}$ which gives the required adjuntion, becasue clearly these maps are inverse of each other. To end the proof we need to check that π^{-1} is an exact functor, and this follows by the exactness of $\varinjlim$. □

Example 6.3.5. 1. We can use the same counterexample used in [30], remark 1.3.8 to see that π_* is not fully faithful. Let X be the closed unit disc on k, with k non-archimedean, and let x_0 be the maximal point of X. We construct two sheaves $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{F}'$ on X_G as follows. Let Y be a dagger analytic domain in X. Then define $\mathscr{F}(Y) = \mathbb{Z}$ if $x_0 \in Y$, and $\mathscr{F}(Y) = 0$ otherwise and $\mathscr{F}'(Y) = \mathbb{Z}$ if $\{x \in X | r < |T(x)| < 1\} \cup \{x_0\} \subset Y$ for some $0 < r < 1$, and $\mathscr{F}'(Y) = 0$ otherwise. The sheaves $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{F}'$ are manifestly not isomorphic, but $\pi_*\mathscr{F} = \pi_*\mathscr{F}' = i_*\mathbb{Z}$, where i is the embedding $\{x_0\} \to X$.

Let us denote with $X_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ the pro-site of X relative to the Grothendieck topology of X defined by the topological space structure, see definition A.2.2. There is canonical morphism of topoi

$$\overline{f} = (f_*, f^{-1}) : X_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to X$$

and moreover also a morphism

$$\overline{g} = (g_*, g^{-1}) : X_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to X_G$$

Proposition 6.3.6. *The following diagram of morphism of topoi*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{\mathbf{Pro}} & \xrightarrow{\overline{f}} & X \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \overline{g}} & \nearrow{\scriptstyle \overline{\pi}} & \\ X_G & & \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Proof. The morphism $\overline{f} : X_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to X$ is a topos morphism as shown in the appendix A. The map $\overline{f}$ factors through $\overline{g}$ by the definition of the site X_G. □

We recall also, from appendix A, that we can pullback the structural sheaf of X to $X_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ giving to $X_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ the structure of a ringed topos. Hence, the morphisms $\overline{\pi}, \overline{f}, \overline{g}$ defines naturally adjoint pairs of functors

$$\pi_* : \mathbf{Mod}(X_G) \leftrightarrows \mathbf{Mod}(X) : \pi^*$$

$$f_* : \mathbf{Mod}(X_{\mathbf{Pro}}) \leftrightarrows \mathbf{Mod}(X) : f^*$$

$$g_* : \mathbf{Mod}(X_{\mathbf{Pro}}) \leftrightarrows \mathbf{Mod}(X_G) : g^*$$

where the image functor is as above the restriction functor and the pullback functors are defined

$$\pi^*(\mathscr{F}) \doteq \pi^{-1}\mathscr{F} \otimes_{\pi^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_{X_G}$$

$$f^*(\mathscr{F}) \doteq f^{-1}\mathscr{F} \otimes_{f^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathbf{Pro}}}$$

$$g^*(\mathscr{F}) \doteq g^{-1}\mathscr{F} \otimes_{g^{-1}\mathcal{O}_{X_G}} \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathbf{Pro}}}.$$

Definition 6.3.7. *Let $\mathscr{F} \in \mathbf{Mod}(X)$ we says that $\mathscr{F}$ is* coherent *if locally on X is isomorphic to a cokernel of a morphism of free finite rank modules. We denote with $\mathbf{Coh}(X)$ the category of coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules over X and with $\mathbf{Pic}(X) = H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X^\times)$ the Picard group of X.*

Definition 6.3.8. *For any object $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Coh}(X))$ we define the* support *of $\mathscr{F}$ as the set*

$$\mathrm{Supp}\,(\mathscr{F}) \doteq \{x \in X | \mathscr{F}_x \neq 0\}.$$

Moreover, for any ideal sheaf $\mathscr{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_X$ the variety *of $\mathscr{I}$ is defined*

$$V(\mathscr{I}) \doteq \mathrm{Supp}\left(\frac{\mathcal{O}_X}{\mathscr{I}}\right).$$

Proposition 6.3.9. *If X is a good k-dagger analytic space, then*

1. *for any $\mathcal{O}_X$-module $\mathscr{F}$ one has*
$$\mathscr{F} \cong \pi_*\pi^*\mathscr{F};$$
so, in particular the functor π^* is fully faithful;

2. *the functor π^* restricts to an equivalence of categories $\mathbf{Coh}(X) \to \mathbf{Coh}(X_G)$;*

3. *a coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-module $\mathscr{F}$ is locally free if and only if $\pi^*(\mathscr{F})$ is locally free.*

Proof. 1. It is sufficient to verify that for any point $x \in X$ there is an isomorphism of stalks $\mathscr{F}_x \cong (\pi_*\pi^*\mathscr{F})_x$. But this easily follows from the definitions because x has a neighborhood which is an affinoid domain which implies that each point has a basis of neighborhood consisting of dagger affinoid domains.

2. Since π^* is fully faithful, it suffices to verify that for a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}$-module $\mathscr{F}$ the $\mathcal{O}_X$-module $\pi_*\mathscr{F}$ is coherent and $\mathscr{F} \cong \pi^*\pi_*\mathscr{F}$. And since X is good then $\pi_*\mathscr{F}$ is clearly coherent and by the coherence of $\pi_*\mathscr{F}$ it follows that on a net of k-dagger affinoid domains $\{U_i\}$ of X_G the sheaf $\pi^*\pi_*\mathscr{F}$ is associated to finite $\{U_i\}$ modules which agrees with $\mathscr{F}(U_i)$, hence the assertion.

3. We may assume that $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ is k-dagger affinoid since we are dealing with a local property. Since A is Noetherian it suffices to show that a finite A-module M is projective if and only if the $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}$-module associated to M is locally free. The direct implication follows by the characterization of projectivity on Noetherian modules. Indeed a finitely presented module M is projective if and only if it is locally free for the Zaraski topology of Spec (A), and this readily implies that M is locally free on $\mathcal{M}(A)$. Conversely, suppose that for some finite k-dagger affinoid covering $\{V_i\}$ of X the finite A_{V_i}-modules $M \otimes_A^\dagger A_{V_i}$ are free. It suffices to verify that M is flat over A, because in the case we are considering flatness is equivalent to projectivity. For this we take an injective homomorphism of finite A-modules $P \to Q$. Then the homomorphisms
$$(M \otimes_A^\dagger P) \otimes_A^\dagger A_{V_i} \to (M \otimes_A^\dagger Q) \otimes_A^\dagger A_{V_i},$$
are also injective for all i, because we are supposing $M \otimes_A^\dagger A_{V_i}$ free. Applying Tate's Acyclicity Theorem to the finite A-modules $M \otimes_A^\dagger P$ and $M \otimes_A^\dagger Q$, we obtain the injectivity of the homomorphism $M \otimes_A^\dagger P \to M \otimes_A^\dagger Q$.

□

Corollary 6.3.10. *If X is a good k-dagger analytic space, then there is an isomorphism* $\mathbf{Pic}(X) \cong \mathbf{Pic}(X_G)$.

Proposition 6.3.11. *Let (X, A, τ) be a good k-dagger analytic space:*

1. *for any abelian sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on X, one has $H^q(X, \mathscr{F}) \cong H^q(X_G, \pi^{-1}\mathscr{F})$, for any $q \geqslant 0$;*
2. *then $H^q(X, \mathscr{F}) \cong H^q(X_G, \pi^*\mathscr{F})$, for any $q \geqslant 0$ and any $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Coh}(X))$.*

Proof. 1. An open covering of X is a covering in the usual and the G-topology, and therefore it generates two Leray spectral sequences that are convergent to the groups $H^q(X, \mathscr{F})$ and $H^q(X_G, \pi^{-1}\mathscr{F})$, respectively. Comparing them, we see that it suffices to verify the statement for sufficiently small X, so we can assume that X is paracompact. It suffices to verify that if $\mathscr{F}$ is injective, then $H^q(X_G, \pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}) = 0$ for $q \geqslant 1$. Since X is paracompact, it suffices to verify that the Cech cohomology groups of $\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}$ with respect to a locally finite covering by compact analytic domains are trivial. And choosing such a covering $\{U_i\}$ for which the topological interiors of the U_i covers X, which can always be done because X is good, the Cech cohomology groups of $\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}$ with respect to this covering agree with the Cech cohomology groups of $\mathscr{F}$ with respect to the covering of X obtained by the topological interior of U_i, and hence vanishes.

2. The same reasoning reduces the situation to the case when $X \subset \mathcal{M}(A)$ is an open paracompact subset of a k-dagger affinoid space, and we can suppose that X doesn't intersect the border of $\mathcal{M}(A)$. In this case $H^q(X, \mathscr{F})$ is an inductive limit of the q-th cohomology groups of the Cech complexes associated with locally finite open coverings $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ of X. On other hand, since the cohomology groups of a coherent sheaf on a dagger affinoid space are trivial with respect to its weak G-topology, then $H^q(X_G, \pi^*\mathscr{F})$ is the q-th cohomology group of the Cech complex associated with an arbitrary locally finite affinoid covering $\{V_j\}_{j\in J}$ of X. It remains to remark that for any open covering $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ we can find a dagger affinoid covering $\{V_j\}_{j\in J}$ such that each V_j is contained in some U_i and $\bigcup_j \mathrm{Int}\,(V_j/X) = X$, because $X \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(\mathcal{M}(A))$ and U_i are open in X.

□

We remark that a morphism of k-dagger analytic spaces $\phi : Y \to X$ induces a morphism of G-ringed topological spaces $\phi_G : Y_G \to X_G$. If the spaces X and Y are good, then for

any coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-module $\mathscr{F}$ there is a canonical isomorphism of coherent $\mathcal{O}_{Y_G}$-modules

$$\pi_Y^*(\phi^*\mathscr{F}) \cong \phi_G^*(\pi_X^*\mathscr{F})$$

which can be readily verified by calculating the sections on any analytic domain of Y.

Lemma 6.3.12. *The following properties of a morphism of k-dagger analytic spaces $\phi : Y \to X$ are equivalent*

1. *for any point $x \in X$ there exist k-dagger affinoid domains $V_1, \ldots, V_n \subset X$ such that $x \in V_1 \cap \ldots \cap V_n$ and the induces maps $\phi^{-1}(V_i) \to V_i$ are finite morphisms (resp. closed immersions) of k-dagger affinoid spaces;*
2. *for any dagger affinoid domain $V \subset X$, $\phi^{-1}(V) \to V$ is a finite morphism (resp. a closed immersion) of k-dagger affinoid spaces.*

Proof. The second condition implies the first obviously. So, suppose that the first condition is true. Then the collection τ of all dagger affinoid domains $V \subset X$ such that $\phi^{-1}(V) \to V$ is a finite morphism (resp. a closed immersion) of affinoid spaces is a net. So, since an arbitrary dagger affinoid domain V is compact then $V \subset V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_n$ for some $V \in \tau$. By proposition 6.2.4, we can find affinoid domains $U_1, \ldots, U_m \subset X$ such that $V = U_1 \cup \ldots \cup U_m$ and each U_i is contained in some V_i. So this implies that ϕ induces a finite morphism (resp. closed immersion) on each U_i (because they are subdomains of some V_j) and so by Kiehl theorem ϕ induces the same kind of morphism on V. □

Definition 6.3.13. *A morphism $\phi : Y \to X$ satisfying the equivalent properties of the previous lemma is said to be* finite *(resp. a* closed immersion*).*

A finite morphism $\phi : Y \to X$ induces a compact map with finite fibres on the underlying topological spaces, and $\phi_*(\mathcal{O}_{Y_G})$ is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}$-module. If ϕ is a closed immersion, then it induces a homeomorphism of the topological space Y with its image in X, and the homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{X_G} \to \phi_*(\mathcal{O}_{Y_G})$ is surjective. Its kernel is a coherent sheaf of ideals in $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}$. Furthermore, we say that a subset $Z \subset X$ is *Zariski closed* if, for any dagger affinoid domain $V \subset X$, the intersection $Z \cap V$ is *Zariski closed* in V. The complement to a Zariski closed subset is called *Zariski open*. If $\phi : Y \to X$ is a closed immersion, then the image of Y is Zariski closed in X. Conversely, if Z is Zariski closed in X, then there is a closed immersion $Y \to X$ that identifies the underlying topological space of Y with Z.

Furthermore, a morphism of k-dagger analytic spaces $\phi : Y \to X$ is said to be a *G-locally* (resp. locally) *closed immersion* if there exist a quasinet τ of analytic (resp. open analytic) domains in Y and, for each $V \in \tau$, an analytic (resp. an open analytic) domain $U \subset X$ such that ϕ induces a closed immersion $V \to U$.

Proposition 6.3.14. *The category $\mathbf{An}_k^\dagger$ admits fibre products.*

Proof. The same argument of [30], proposition 1.4.1 applies. □

Definition 6.3.15. *A morphism of k-dagger analytic spaces $\phi : Y \to X$ is said to be* separated *(resp.* locally separated*) if the diagonal morphism $\Delta_{Y/X} : Y \to Y \times_X Y$ is a closed (resp. a locally closed) immersion. If the canonical morphism $X \to \mathcal{M}(k)$ is separated (resp. locally separated), then X is said to be* separated *(resp.* locally separated*).*

Recall that a continuous map of topological spaces $f : Y \to X$ is said to be *Hausdorff* if for any pair of different points $x, y \in Y$ with $f(x) = f(y)$ there exist open neighborhoods U_x of x and U_y of y with $U_x \cap U_y = \varnothing$. This is equivalent to require that the image of Y in $Y \times_X Y$ is closed, and so applying this definition to the identity map one recover the

definition of Hausdorff topological space. We remark that if $f : Y \to X$ is a map Hausdorff and X is a Hausdorff topological space, then also Y is a Hausdorff topological space.

Furthermore, let X and Y be topological spaces and suppose that each point of X has a compact neighborhood. In this situation a compact (or proper) map $f : X \to Y$ is Hausdorff, it takes closed subsets of Y to closed subsets of X, and each point of Y has a compact neighborhood.

Proposition 6.3.16. *A locally separated morphism of k-dagger analytic spaces $\phi : Y \to X$ is separated if and only if the induces continuous map is Hausdorff.*

Proof. If a morphism $\phi : Y \to X$ is separated, then the set-theoretic image of Y is closed in the topological space $Y \times_X Y$, because it is correspond to $V(\mathscr{I})$ for some coherent ideal sheaf on the analytic space $Y \times_X Y$. By the construction of the fiber product, *cf.* [30], one can see that exists a canonical map

$$\pi : |Y \times_X Y| \to Y \times_X Y$$

where $|Y \times_X Y|$ is the underlying topological space of the fiber product of the k-dagger analytic spaces X and Y and $Y \times_X Y$ is the fiber product of the two underlying topological spaces. π is compact, then, as remarked above is in particular a closed map, so $\pi(\phi(Y))$ is closed also in $Y \times_X Y$.

On the other hand, suppose that the map $\phi : Y \to X$ induces a Hausdorff map of topological spaces, then $W = (Y \times_X Y) - \Delta_{Y/X}(Y)$ is open. Since the diagonal morphism $\Delta_{Y/X}$ is a composition of a closed immersion with an open immersion, it suffices to show that $\Delta_{Y/X}(Y)$ is closed in $|Y \times_X Y|$. For this we consider the compact map π and $z \in (Y \times_X Y) - \Delta_{Y/X}(Y)$, and let $\pi(Z) = (y_1, y_2)$. If $y_1 \neq y_2$ then $\pi^{-1}(W)$ is an open neighborhood of z that does not meet $\Delta_{Y/X}(Y)$. If $y_1 = y_2$, then we take an open neighborhood V of $y_1 = y_2$ such that $\Delta_{V/X} : V \to V \times_X V$ is a closed immersion. Since $V \times_X V$ is an open subset of $Y \times_X V$ and $z \notin \Delta_{Y/X}(Y)$, then we can find an open neighborhood of z that does not meet $\Delta_{Y/X}(Y)$. The required fact follows. □

In particular it follows that if Y is separated, then its underlying topological space is Hausdorff.

Corollary 6.3.17. *A morphism of good k-dagger analytic spaces is separated if and only if the induces continuous map is Hausdorff. In particular a good k-dagger analytic space is separated if and only if is Hausdorff.*

Proof. Good k-dagger spaces are locally separated because every point has a neighborhood isomorphic to a k-dagger affinoid space, which are separated. □

Proposition 6.3.18. *If (X, A, τ) is a separated k-dagger analytic space, then $\pi^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X \cong \mathcal{O}_{X_G}$.*

Proof. Let $U \subset X$ be an admissible open for the G-topology of X, *i.e.* an analytic domain. Then if U is open $\pi^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X(U) = \mathcal{O}_{X_G}(U)$ by the fact that the direct limit becomes trivial. Then we only need to check the lemma for $U \in \widehat{\tau} = \tau$ because this data defines the k-dagger analytic structure of X up to unique isomorphism. So, if $U \in \tau$ we get

$$\pi^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X(U) = \varinjlim_{V \supset U} \mathcal{O}_X(U) = \varinjlim_{V \supset U} \mathcal{O}_{X_G}(U) \cong A_U$$

because the couple (X, U) can be thought as a germ of analytic space, in the sense of Berkovich, which is wide, because X is separated and we are using atlases of dagger affinoid algebras and we showed that the category of affinoid germs of analytic spaces is anti-equivalent to the category of dagger affinoid algebras. □

Corollary 6.3.19. *If X is a good, separated k-dagger analytic space, then the functor π^* induces an equivalence of categories* $\mathbf{Mod}(X) \to \mathbf{Mod}(X_G)$.

Proof. By 6.3.9 we need only to show that for any $\mathcal{O}_{X_G}$-module the isomorphism $\mathscr{F} \cong \pi^*\pi_*\mathscr{F}$. And this follows form the isomorphism $\pi^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X \cong \mathcal{O}_{X_G}$ shown in the previous proposition. □

6.4 Relations with classical analytic geometries

In this section we study the relations between the analytic spaces we constructed so far and some other already given in literature. In particular we first compare our k-dagger analytic spaces with the rigid analytic spaces of defined by Tate. We do this in two steps: first we introduce a category of rigid k-dagger spaces very similar to dagger spaces of Grösse-Klonne, and compare our spaces with them; after this we use similar argument to [33] for comparing this category of rigid k-dagger spaces with the category of rigid analytic spaces. In the subsequent section we examine the relations with classical complex analytic spaces for archimedean dagger analytic spaces.

We end this chapter explaining how the GAGA principles looks like in this context.

6.4.1 Non-archimedean case

Assume that k is a non-archimedean complete valued field and that the valuation on k is nontrivial. Let X be a Hausdorff strictly k-analytic space and consider the set

$$X_0 = \{x \in X | [\mathcal{H}(x) : k] < \infty\}.$$

(From [28], proposition 2.1.15, it follows that the set X_0 is everywhere dense in X.) If $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$ is strictly k-dagger affinoid space then $X_0 = \mathrm{Max}\,(A)$, so X_0 can be equipped with the structure of dagger analytic space analogous to that given by Grösse-Klonne in [33]. Here we consider on X_0 the weak (and strong) G-topology generated by the family of dagger affinoid subdomains of X_0. This is in contrast with the work of Grösse-Klonne who considered the finer topology given by the rigid G-topology obtained by canonically associating to A the G-topology of the affinoid space obtained completing A with respect to its norm. So we give the following definition:

Definition 6.4.1. *A locally G-ringed space $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ whose G-topology is saturated is said a* rigid k-dagger space *if there exists a covering*

$$X = \bigcup_i U_i$$

by admissible open subsets such that $(U_i, \mathcal{O}_X|_{U_i})$ is isomorphic to the locally G-ringed space of a dagger affinoid space associated to some strict k-dagger algebra A_i. A morphism of rigid k-dagger spaces is a morphism of locally G-ringed spaces.

So, we can state for rigid k-dagger spaces the following standard definitions.

Definition 6.4.2. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a morphism of rigid k-dagger space. We say that f is*

1. *an* open immersion *if is injective and if for any $x \in X$ the canonical morphism $f_x : \mathcal{O}_{Y,f(x)} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is an isomorphism;*
2. *a* closed immersion *if is injective and if the canonical map $\mathcal{O}_Y \to f_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ is surjective;*
3. *a* locally closed immersion *if is injective and if the canonical maps $f_x : \mathcal{O}_{Y,f(x)} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ are surjective for all $x \in X$;*

4. quasi-compact *if for any quasi-compact open subspace $Y' \subset Y$ the inverse image $f^{-1}(Y')$ is a quasi-compact subset of X;*

5. quasi-separated *if the diagonal morphism $\Delta_{X/Y} : X \to X \times_Y X$ is a closed immersion;*

6. separated *if the diagonal morphism $\Delta_{X/Y} : X \to X \times_Y X$ is quasi-compact morphism.*

Definition 6.4.3. *A rigid k-dagger space X is said*

1. quasi-compact *if it has a finite admissible covering by dagger affinoid subdomains;*

2. quasi-separated *(resp.* proper *(see below), resp.* separated*) if the canonical morphism $X \to \mathcal{M}(k)$ is quasi-separated (resp. proper, resp. separated);*

3. normal at a point $x \in X$ *if $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a normal ring; is said* normal *if is normal at every point;*

4. reduced at a point $x \in X$ *if $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a reduced ring; is said* reduced *if is reduced at every point;*

5. smooth at a point $x \in X$ *if $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a regular ring; is said* smooth *(or* regular*) if is smooth at every point;*

6. quasi-algebraic *if there exists an admissible covering $X = \bigcup X_i$ such that for all i there exists an open immersion $X_i \hookrightarrow Y_i^{\mathrm{an}}$ into the analytification of a k-scheme Y_i of finite type (see section 6.4.3 for the definition of the dagger analytification of a k-scheme of finite type).*

Now, suppose that X is an arbitrary Hausdorff strictly k-dagger analytic space. We say that a subset $U \subset X_0$ is admissible open if, for any strictly dagger affinoid domain $V \subset X$, the intersection $U \cap V_0$ is an admissible open subset in the rigid k-dagger affinoid space V_0. In the same way, a covering $\{V_i\}_{i\in I}$ of an admissible open subset $U \subset X_0$ by admissible open subsets is said *admissible* if, for any strictly dagger affinoid domain $V \subset X$, $\{V_i \cap V_0\}_{i\in I}$ is an admissible open covering of $V_0 \cap U$. In this way we get a G-topology on the set X_0 and sheaves of rings $\mathcal{O}_{V_0}$, with $V_0 = V \cap X_0$, where V runs through the strictly dagger affinoid domains in X and these sheaves are compatible on intersections. So these sheaves glue together to give a sheaf of rings $\mathcal{O}_{X_0}$ on the G-topological space X_0. The locally G-ringed space $(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})$ constructed in this way is thus a quasiseparated rigid k-dagger space.

Definition 6.4.4. *A collection of subsets of a set is said to be* of finite type *if each subset of the collection meets only a finite number of other subsets of the collection.*

The next theorem is the dagger analogous of theorem 1.6.1 of [30].

Theorem 6.4.5. *The correspondence $(X, A, \tau) \mapsto (X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})$ is a fully faithful functor from the category of Hausdorff strictly k-dagger analytic spaces to the category of quasiseparated rigid k-dagger spaces. This functor induces an equivalence between, the category of paracompact strictly k-analytic spaces and the category of quasiseparated rigid k-dagger spaces that have an admissible dagger affinoid covering of finite type.*

Proof. Let X be a Hausdorff strictly k-dagger analytic space. We need the following dagger version lemma 1.6.2 of [30].

Lemma 6.4.6. 1. *Any open dagger affinoid domain in the rigid k-dagger space X_0 is of the form V_0 for a $V \subset X$, a strictly dagger affinoid domain in X.*

2. *A system $\{V_i\}_{i\in I}$ of strictly dagger affinoid domains in X induces an admissible covering of X_0 if and only if each point of X has a neighborhood of the form $V_{i_1} \cup \ldots \cup V_{i_n}$ (*i.e. *, if and only if $\{V_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a quasinet on X).*

Proof. 1. Let $f : U_0 \to X_0$ be an open k-dagger affinoid domain in X_0 and $V \subset X$ a strictly k-dagger affinoid domain in X. Then, $f^{-1}(V_0)$ is a finite union of dagger affinoid domains in U_0, and the family $\{f^{-1}(V_0)\}$, where V runs through strictly k-dagger affinoid domains in X, is a dagger affinoid covering of U_0. It follows that we can find strictly k-dagger affinoid domains $U_1, \ldots, U_n \subset U$ and $V_1, \ldots, V_n \subset X$ such that $U = U_1 \cup \ldots \cup U_n$ and $f|_{(U_i)_0}$ is induced by a morphism of strictly k-dagger affinoid spaces $\phi_i : U_i \to V_i$, that identifies U_i with a k-dagger affinoid domain in V_i. Clearly, all morphisms ϕ_i are compatible on intersections, therefore, they induces a morphism of strictly k-dagger analytic spaces $\phi : U \to X$. Since ϕ, as a map of topological spaces, is proper and induces an injection on the everywhere dense subset $U_0 \subset U$, it follows that ϕ induces a homeomorphism of U with its image in X. Finally, ϕ identifies U_i, with a strictly k-dagger affinoid domain in V_i and therefore ϕ identifies U with a strictly k-dagger affinoid domain in X.

2. Suppose first that $\{(V_i)_0\}$ is an admissible covering of X_0 for some strictly k-dagger affinoid domain $V_i \subset X$. This means that, for any strictly k-dagger affinoid domain $V \subset X$ the family

$$\{V_0 \cap (V_i)_0\}_{i \in I}$$

is an admissible covering of V_0. It follows that V is contained in a finite union $V_{i_1} \cup \ldots \cup V_{i_n}$, and so it follows that each point of X has a neighborhood made of a finite unions of elements of $\{V_i\}$. Conversely, assume that the latter property is true. Then any strictly k-dagger affinoid domain is contained in a finite union $V_{i_1} \cup \ldots \cup V_{i_n}$ and therefore $\{(V_i)_0 \cap V_0\}_{i \in I}$ is an admissible covering of V_0.

□

To check that the functor $(X, A, \tau) \mapsto (X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})$ is fully faithful one only need to use the previous lemma and some properties of the rigid G-topology which are true also for rigid dagger G-topology we used to define $(X_0, \mathcal{O}_{X_0})$. So we omit this part that is identical to [30]. Instead we find more interesting to check the equivalence between paracompact Hausdorff strictly k-dagger spaces and quasiseparated rigid k-dagger spaces.

If X is a paracompact strictly k-dagger analytic space, then it has a strictly k-dagger affinoid atlas with a locally finite net, and therefore the rigid k-dagger space X_0 has an admissible affinoid covering of finite type. It is also quasiseparated because of the first point of previous lemma and lemma 6.2.4. Conversely, let $\mathcal{X}$ be a quasiseparated rigid k-dagger space that has an admissible affinoid covering $\{U_i\}$ of finite type. First let's fix k-dagger affinoid spaces $\mathcal{M}(A_i) = V_i$ such that $(V_i)_0 \cong U_i$, where the A_i are strictly k-dagger affinoid algebras. Since $\mathcal{X}$ is quasiseparated, for any pair $i, j \in I$ the intersection $U_i \cap U_j$ is a finite union of open affinoid domains in $\mathcal{X}$. Thus, there are strictly dagger special domains $V_{i,j} \subset V_i$ and $V_{i,j} \subset V_j$ that correspond to $U_i \cap U_j$, under the identifications $U_i \mapsto (V_i)_0$. Let $\nu_{i,j} : V_i \to V_j$ denote the induced isomorphism. It is clear that this system of maps satisfies the glueing properties stated so far, enabling the application of proposition 6.2.26 to get a paracompact strictly k-dagger analytic space X which by the way it was constructed is such that $X_0 \cong \mathcal{X}$.

□

Now it's easy to describe a functor from rigid k-dagger spaces to the category of rigid k-analytic spaces due to work of Grösse-Klonne. If A is a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra we can equip A canonically of a norm whose bornology doesn't depend on the representation of A as a quotient of some Monsky-Washnitzer algebra with respect to an ideal. This norm is the norm used by Grosse-Klönne in [33] and can be canonically attached to A in the following way. Let $P = \{p_\rho\}_{\rho > 1}$ be the family of norms on A which define the dagger bornology of A. This family is a chain in the lattice of all seminorms over A, so we can equip A with the

infimum of this family, which is not an element of P because otherwise the bornology on A would be given by a norm.

By [33] the completion of A with respect to this norm gives a k-Banach algebra $\widehat{A}$ which is an affinoid algebra and if $f : A \to B$ is a morphism of strict k-dagger algebra, then f induces a morphism $\widehat{f} : \widehat{A} \to \widehat{B}$ between the strict k-affinoid algebras.

Proposition 6.4.7. *Consider the functor* $\widehat{\cdot} : \mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger \to \mathbf{Aff}_k$. *Then* $\mathcal{M}(A) \cong \mathcal{M}(\widehat{A})$ *and there is a canonical map of G-topological spaces* $\mathrm{Max}\,(\widehat{A}) \to \mathrm{Max}\,(A)$ *is continuous.*

Proof. The homeomorphism $\mathcal{M}(A) \cong \mathcal{M}(\widehat{A})$ its clear by our study of bornological spectrum. Then, the map $\mathrm{Max}\,(\widehat{A}) \to \mathrm{Max}\,(A)$ is continuous because every dagger affinoid subdomain is obviously an affinoid subdomain. □

We remark that there seems to be no functor, at least no obvious one, from the category of affinoid spaces to the category of dagger affinoid spaces. To see this one can consider a closed immersion $T_k^n \to \frac{T_k^n}{(f_1,\ldots,f_r)} = A$ where $f_1, \ldots, f_r$ are non-overconvergent functions. It is hard to imagine how to put a dagger structure on A in a natural way, and probably there is not such a structure.

We can extend the functor $\widehat{\cdot} : \mathbf{Aff}_k^\dagger \to \mathbf{Aff}_k$ to a global functor $\widehat{\cdot} : \mathbf{Rig}_k^\dagger \to \mathbf{Rig}_k$, which, following [33], has the following properties

Theorem 6.4.8. *The functor* $\widehat{\cdot} : \mathbf{Rig}_k^\dagger \to \mathbf{Rig}_k$ *has the following properties*

1. $\widehat{\cdot}$ *induces isomorphisms between the local rings of the structure sheaves;*
2. X *is connected (resp. normal, resp. reduced, resp. smooth) if and only if* $\widehat{X}$ *is;*
3. $f : X \to Y$ *is a closed immersion (resp. an open immersion, resp. a locally closed immersion, resp. an isomorphism, resp. quasicompact, resp. separated) if and only if* $\widehat{f} : \widehat{X} \to \widehat{Y}$ *is;*
4. *if* $f : X \to Y$ *is finite, then* $\widehat{f}$ *is finite;*
5. *if* X *is a quasialgebraic rigid space, there exists an admissible affinoid covering* $X = \bigcup U_i$ *and affinoid dagger spaces* V_i *and isomorphisms* $\widehat{V}_i \cong U_i$.

Proof.
1. We already remarked that is well known dagger affinoid subdomains are a base of neighborhood of any point in rigid affinoid space.
2. The assertion about connectedness follows from the homeomorphism $\mathcal{M}(A) \cong \mathcal{M}(\widehat{A})$ for dagger affinoid spaces and the others form the previous point.
3. [33].
4. [33].
5. [33].

□

Definition 6.4.9. *Let* X *be a rigid* k*-dagger space we say that an* $\mathcal{O}_X$*-module* $\mathscr{F}$ *is* coherent *if there exists an admissible affinoid covering* $\{U_i\}$ *of* X *such that* $\mathscr{F}|_{U_i}$ *is associated to a finite* $\mathcal{O}_X(U_i)$*-module.*

The functor $\widehat{\cdot}$ naturally extends to a functor $\widehat{\cdot}: \mathbf{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathbf{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}})$ in the following way. Given a dagger affinoid domain $X = \mathrm{Max}\,(A)$ and an A-module M we get functorially a $\widehat{A}$-module by considering the module

$$\widehat{M} \doteq M \otimes_A \widehat{A}.$$

Clearly if M is a finite A-module then $\widehat{M}$ is a finite $\widehat{A}$-module, so this gives a functor $\mathbf{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathbf{Coh}(\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}})$ when X is dagger affinoid space because of the Kiehl theorem. It' easy to verify that this definition globalize and so given a coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-module $\mathscr{F}$, for a general rigid k-dagger space, then if $\{U_i\}$ is covering such that $\mathscr{F}|_{U_i}$ is associated to a finite $\mathcal{O}_X(U_i)$-module the data of the sheaves $\widehat{\mathscr{F}|_{U_i}}$ associated to finite $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}(\widehat{U}_i)$-modules define a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}$-module.

Definition 6.4.10. *Let $X = \mathrm{Max}\,(A) \to Y = \mathrm{Max}\,(B)$ be a morphism of k-dagger affinoid spaces. We say that a dagger subdomain $U \subset X$ is* relatively compact in X with respect to Y*, and we write $U \Subset_Y X$ if there exists a surjection $\phi : B\langle X_1, \dots, X_n\rangle^\dagger \to A$ and $\epsilon < 1$ such that*

$$U \subset \mathrm{Max}\,(A\langle \epsilon^{-1}\phi(X_1), \dots, \epsilon^{-1}\phi(X_n)\rangle^\dagger) \subset X.$$

Definition 6.4.11. *A morphism $f : X \to Y$ of rigid k-dagger spaces is called* partially proper *if f is separated and there exist admissible affinoid coverings $Y = \bigcup Y_i$ and $f^{-1}(Y_i) = \bigcup X_{i,j}$ (all i), such that for every $X_{i,j}$ there is an admissible open affinoid subset $\tilde{X}_{i,j} \subset f^{-1}(Y_i)$ with $X_{i,j} \Subset_{Y_i} \tilde{X}_{i,j}$.*

A morphism $f : X \to Y$ is said proper *if is partially proper and quasi-compact.*

Definition 6.4.12. *Let X be a rigid k-dagger space. We says that X is* Stein *if it admits a dagger affinoid exhaustion* i.e. *a covering $\{U_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that*

$$X = \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} U_i$$

and $U_i \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(U_{i+1})$ for all i.

Clearly every Stein rigid k-dagger space is partially proper.

Theorem 6.4.13. *If A is a partially proper rigid k-dagger spaces then $\widehat{\cdot} : \mathbf{Coh}(X) \to \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{X})$ is an equivalence and for every $\mathscr{F} \in \mathbf{Coh}(X)$ we have*

$$\mathscr{F}(X) \cong \widehat{\mathscr{F}}(\widehat{X}).$$

Proof. Let's address first the case where $X = \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} U_i$ is Stein. Let $\mathscr{G}$ be a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}$-module. Since $U_i \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(U_{i+1})$ then $\mathscr{G}$ defines a $\mathcal{O}_X(U_i)$-module, let's denote it with $\mathscr{F}(U_i)$, for any i. For Kiehl theorem we get coherent $\mathcal{O}_X|_{U_i}$-modules which by definition glues to give a $\mathcal{O}_X$-module $\mathscr{F}$. So, $\widehat{\mathscr{F}}$ is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}$-module and $\widehat{\mathscr{F}} = \mathscr{G}$. Moreover $\mathscr{F}(X) = \mathscr{G}(\widehat{X})$ because

$$\mathscr{F}(X) = \varprojlim \mathcal{O}_X(U_i) = \varprojlim \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X}}(\widehat{U}_i) = \mathscr{G}(\widehat{X})$$

which is due to the fact that the projective systems are cofinal one in each other.

For the general case it is enough to show any partially proper rigid k-dagger space has an admissible open covering $X = \bigcup S_j$ where S_j are Stein and their finite intersection are Stein. And such a covering can be constructed from a dagger affinoid covering $X = \bigcup V_i$ for which there exists, by partially properness hypothesis, an admissible open dagger affinoid $Z_j \subset X$ with $V_j \subset \mathrm{Int}\,(Z_j)$, as explained in [33].

□

Theorem 6.4.14. *The functor $\widehat{\cdot}$ induces an equivalence between the category of partially proper rigid k-dagger spaces and the category partially proper rigid k-analytic spaces.*

Proof. First let's show that the functor is essentially surjective. Let X be a partially proper rigid k-analytic space, then by what we saw in the proof of the previous theorem we have that for any admissible open affinoid domain $U \subset X$ there exists another admissible open affinoid domain $V \subset X$ such that $U \subset \mathrm{Int}(V)$. This inclusion induces a dagger structure on U and clearly the rigid k-dagger analytic space, $X^\dagger$, obtained gluing this dagger affinoid spaces is such that $(\widehat{X^\dagger}, \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{X^\dagger}}) \cong (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$.

Then, to show that $\widehat{\cdot}$ is fully faithful can be done as [33] theorem 2.27. □

Example 6.4.15. The prototype of Stein rigid k-(dagger)analytic space is the affine space, which is defined as the direct limit

$$(\mathbb{A}_k^n)^\dagger \doteq \varinjlim_{\rho \to \infty} \mathrm{Max}\,(W_k^n(\rho))$$

in the dagger case and

$$\mathbb{A}_k^n \doteq \varinjlim_{\rho \to \infty} \mathrm{Max}\,(T_k^n(\rho))$$

in the rigid case. And applying the functor $\widehat{\cdot}$ we get $\widehat{(\mathbb{A}_k^n)^\dagger} \cong \mathbb{A}_k^n$. Moreover, as a particular case of above result we can deduce that for any coherent sheaf $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,((\mathbb{A}_k^n)^\dagger)$ there is an isomorphism $\mathscr{F}((\mathbb{A}_k^n)^\dagger) \cong \widehat{\mathscr{F}}(\mathbb{A}_k^n)$. In particular choosing $\mathscr{F} = \mathcal{O}_X$ we see again the close relationship between the definition of the structural ring on k-dagger analytic space and of k-analytic spaces of Berkovich.

Proposition 6.4.16. *Let X be a partially proper rigid k-dagger space and $\mathscr{F}$ a coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-module then*

$$H^i(X, \mathscr{F}) \cong H^i(\hat{X}, \widehat{\mathscr{F}}).$$

Proof. [33] theorem 3.2. □

We want now to give a bornological version the arguments of section 4 of [33] to obtain Serre and Poincare, Kunneth formula duality and define De Rahm cohomology for dagger spaces. We work over rigid k-dagger spaces and then we extend the results to dagger k-analytic spaces.

So, let's start defining the cohomology with compact support, and with the following dagger version of lemma 1.1 of [37].

Lemma 6.4.17. *Let $p : X \to Y$ be a morphism of rigid dagger analytic spaces, with X separated and Y dagger affinoid. Let dagger affinoid subdomains $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r, Z_1', \ldots, Z_r'$ of X be given such that $Z_j \Subset_Y Z_j'$ for all j. Put $Z = Z_1 \cup \ldots \cup Z_r$ and $Z = Z_1' \cup \ldots \cup Z_r'$. Then $\{X - Z, Z\}$ is an admissible covering of X with respect to its strong G-topology.*

Proof. Let $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an admissible dagger affinoid covering of X. Then $\{X - Z, Z\}$ is an admissible covering if for every $i \in I$ also $\{X_i - (Z_i \cap X_i), Z' \cap X_i\}$ is an admissible covering of X_i. We note that

$$X_j \cap Z_j \Subset_{X_i \times Y} X_j \cap Z_j'$$

holds for any $i \in I$ and $l \leqslant j \leqslant r$, where then map $X_j \cap Z_j \to X_i \times Y$ is given by $(1, p)$. Thus we may suppose that X is also a dagger affinoid space. It follows that the covering $\{Z_1, \ldots, Z_r\}$ of Z can be replaced by a covering of Z by dagger rational subdomains of X, by Gerritzen-Grauert theorem. Hence we may suppose that each Z_j is already a rational. If we show that each $\{X - Z_j, Z_j'\}$ is admissible then also each $\{X - Z_j, Z'\}$ is admissible.

Since $\{X-Z, Z'\}$ has as refinement $\bigcap_j \{X-Z_j, Z'\}$ also $\{X-Z, Z'\}$ is admissible, reducing to the case $r=1$.

Let $Z = X\left(\frac{f_i}{g}\right) \subset X$ be a dagger rational subdomain. For a suitable $\rho \in |k^\times|$ one defines

$$X_1 = \{x \in X || g(x)| \geqslant \rho\} \text{ and } X_2 = \{x \in X || g(x)| \leqslant \rho\}.$$

with $Z \subset X_0$ and $Z \cap X_2 = \varnothing$. Replacing X by X_1 and Z is a Weierstrass domain in X given by $Z = X(f_1 g^{-1}, \ldots, f_n g^{-1})$. Similarly, we may suppose that Z' is a Weierstrass domain in X. Let $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ denote dagger generators of $\mathcal{O}_X(Z')$ over $\mathcal{O}_Y(Y)$ such that

$$Z \subset \{z' \in Z' || t_1(z')| < 1, \ldots, |t_m(z')| < 1\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$ is dense in $\mathcal{O}_X(Z')$ we can change the elements t_j such that the new t_j belong to $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$ and are dagger generators of $\mathcal{O}_X(Z)$ over $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$. It follows that $Z' = \{x \in X || t_1(x)| \leqslant 1, \ldots, |t_m(x)| \leqslant 1\}$ and again $Z \subset \{x \in X || t_1(x)| < 1, \ldots, |t_m(x)| < 1\}$. On the dagger affinoid subdomain $A = \{x \in X || t_1(x)| < 1, \ldots, |t_m(x)| < 1\}$ one has

$$\delta(a) \doteq \max\{|f_1(a)|, \ldots, |f_n(a)|\} > 1$$

for all $a \in A$. It follows that for some $\rho \in \sqrt{|k^\times|}$, $\rho < 1$, one has $\delta(a) > \rho^{-1}$ for all $a \in A$. This means that $\{x \in X | \max |f_i((x)| \leqslant \rho^{-1}\} \subset Z'$, and from [26] proposition 5, page 343, it follows that $X - Z$ is an admissible open. Finally, the covering $\{X-Z, Z'\}$ is admissible since it has the following refinement:

$$\{x \in X || f_1(x)| \geqslant \rho^{-1}\}, \ldots, \{x \in X || f_n(x)| \geqslant \rho^{-1}\}, Z'.$$

□

Definition 6.4.18. *Let X be a separated rigid k-dagger space and $Z \subset X$ a finite union of dagger affinoid subdomain. For any abelian sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on X we define*

$$H^0_Z(X, \mathscr{F}) = \operatorname{Ker}\left(H^0(X, \mathscr{F}) \to H^0(X - Z, \mathscr{F})\right).$$

This makes sense since $X - Z$ is an admissible open subset. It is easily seen that $\mathscr{F} \to H^0_Z(X, \mathscr{F})$ is a left exact functor. Its derivatives are denoted by $H^i_z(X, \mathscr{F})$.

Lemma 6.4.19. *Let X, Z and $\mathscr{F}$ be as above, then there exists a long exact sequence:*

$$0 \to H^0_Z(X, \mathscr{F}) \to H^0(X, \mathscr{F}) \to H^0(X - Z, \mathscr{F}) \to$$

$$\to H^1_Z(X, \mathscr{F}) \to H^1(X, \mathscr{F}) \to H^1(X - Z, \mathscr{F}) \to \ldots$$

Proof. [37], lemma 1.3. □

Definition 6.4.20. *Let $p : X \to Y$ be a morphism of rigid k-dagger analytic spaces. Let's denote by $c = c(X/Y)$ the family of subsets of X of the form $Z_1 \cup \ldots \cup Z_n$ where $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ are dagger affinoid subdomains such that there exists dagger affinoid subdomains $Z'_1, \ldots, Z'_n$ with $Z_i \Subset_Y Z'_i$ for all i. For any abelian sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on X we define*

$$H^i_c(X, \mathscr{F}) = \varinjlim_{Z \in c(X/Y)} H^i_Z(X, \mathscr{F})$$

and call it the cohomology with (relative) compact support.

Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a coherent sheaf on a separated rigid k-dagger analytic space X of countable type. Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be an admissible countable (or finite) dagger affinoid covering of X. Then

$$\mathscr{F}(X) = \mathrm{Ker}\left(\prod_{i\in I}\mathscr{F}(X_i) \to \prod_{(i,j)\in I\times I, i<j}\mathscr{F}(X_i\cap X_j)\right)$$

is a closed subspace of the space $\prod_{i\in I}\mathscr{F}(X_i)$. Hence $\mathscr{F}(X)$ has the structure of bornological vector space of convex type and this structure does not depend on the choice of the covering $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$. Let again $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be an admissible covering of X such that the Cech-complex of $\mathscr{F}$ with respect to $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ calculates the cohomology groups $H^\bullet(X,\mathscr{F})$. Of course one could take a dagger affinoid covering of X. The corresponding bornology of convex type on the Cech complex induces a bornology of convex type on the groups $H^\bullet(X,\mathscr{F})$, which is independent of the covering.

Let X be a Stein space then $H^\bullet(X,\mathscr{F}) = 0$ for $i > 0$. Using lemma 6.4.19 one defines bornologies on $H^\bullet_Z(X,\mathscr{F})$. Finally one defines on

$$H^i_c(X,\mathscr{F}) = \varinjlim_{Z\in c(X/Y)} H^i_Z(X,\mathscr{F})$$

the direct limit bornology.

Let A be a dagger affinoid algebra and $d : A \to \Omega_A$ the module of Kahler differentials. If $X = \mathcal{M}(A)$, one gets that the complex of sheaves $\Omega^\bullet_X$ which, if X is smooth, for any i, Ω^i_X is a coherent locally free $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules. Moreover we define

$$\omega_X \doteq \Omega^n_X$$

if X is of pure dimension n.

Theorem 6.4.21. *Suppose that k is maximally complete. Let X be a smooth rigid dagger affinoid space of pure dimension d and $\mathscr{F}$ a coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-module. Then for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant d$ there is a pairing*

$$\mathrm{Ext}^{\,i}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathscr{F};\omega_X) \times H^{d-i}_c(X,\mathscr{F}) \to k$$

functorial in $\mathscr{F}$ and inducing isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Ext}^{\,i}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathscr{F};\omega_X) \cong \left(H^{d-i}_c(X,\mathscr{F})\right)^* = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Born}(k)}(H^{d-i}_c(X,\mathscr{F}),k)$$

and

$$H^{d-i}_c(X,\mathscr{F}) \cong \left(\mathrm{Ext}^{\,i}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathscr{F};\omega_X)\right)^* = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Born}(k)}(\mathrm{Ext}^{\,i}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathscr{F};\omega_X),k).$$

Proof. First of all we notice that it is enough to show the theorem for the case $X = \mathcal{M}(k\langle T_1,\ldots,T_m\rangle^\dagger)$ and then the general case is known to follows studying the canonical closed immersion into the polydisk (see [33], [37], [39]). Then, its well known that

$$H^m_c(X,\omega_X) = \left\{\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^m} a_{-n}T^{-n}dT_1\wedge\ldots\wedge dT_m \,|\, \rho^{|n|}|a_n| \to 0 \text{ for } |n|\to\infty, \forall\rho > 1\right\}.$$

(see [38], [39]) and the canonical pairing $k\langle T_1,\ldots,T_m\rangle^\dagger \times H^m_c(X,\omega_X) \to k$ given by

$$\left(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^m} b_nT^n, \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^m} a_{-n}T^{-n}dT_1\wedge\ldots\wedge dT_m\right) \mapsto \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^m} b_na_{-n-1}$$

induces isomorphisms

$$k\langle T_1,\ldots,T_m\rangle^\dagger \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Born}(k)}(H^m_c(X,\omega_X),k),$$

$$H_c^m(X,\omega_X) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Born}(k)}(k\langle T_1,\ldots,T_m\rangle^\dagger, k)$$

because the direct limits which defines the bornologies on $H_c^m(X,\mathscr{F})$ are compact and hence we obtain LF-regular bornological vector spaces. □

Lemma 6.4.22. *Let $\mathscr{K}^\bullet = (\mathscr{K}^n)$ be a complex of complete bornological k-vector spaces of convex type, with k maximally complete, with all the differential maps being strict morphisms and all $\mathscr{K}^n$ satisfies the Hahn-Banach theorem. Setting $\mathscr{L}^\bullet \doteq ?\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Born}(k)}(\mathscr{K}^\bullet, k)$ one has*

$$H^q(\mathscr{L}^\bullet) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Born}(k)}(H^q(\mathscr{K}^\bullet, k))$$

for all q.

Proof. □

In the case of bornological vector spaces the issue of the validity of Hahn-Banach theorem is more subtle then in the case of locally convex spaces, *i.e.* completeness is no more sufficient. We refer to [24] for a full treatment of this problem.

Lemma 6.4.23. *Suppose k maximally complete. Let X be a smooth rigid dagger Stein space or a smooth rigid dagger affinoid space. Then, all differentials maps $\Omega^i(X) \xrightarrow{d_i} \Omega^{i+1}(X)$ are strict and have closed image.*

Proof. The proof is identical to [33] lemma 4.7. The only thing to check is that the bornological vector spaces involved satisfies the Hahn-Banach theorem to be able to apply the previous lemma. But this is clear since $\Omega^i(X)$ are coherent sheaves which implies that they are normal bornological vector spaces. □

In what follows we suppose that $\mathrm{char}\,(k) = 0$.

Definition 6.4.24. *Let X be a smooth rigid k-dagger space. We define the* de Rham cohomology *of X by*

$$H^\bullet_{\mathrm{dR}}(X) \doteq H^\bullet(X, \Omega^\bullet_X)$$

and the de Rham cohomology with compact support *of X by*

$$H^\bullet_{\mathrm{dR},c}(X) \doteq H^\bullet_c(X, \Omega^\bullet_X).$$

Now, with the previous lemma we can show the following theorem as in [33].

Theorem 6.4.25. *If X is a smooth rigid dagger affinoid space of pure dimension n, there are canonical isomorphisms*

1. $$H^i_{\mathrm{dR}}(X) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Born}(k)}(H^{2n-i}_{\mathrm{dR},c}(X), k)$$

   and

   $$H^{2n-i}_{\mathrm{dR},c}(X) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Born}(k)}(H^i_{\mathrm{dR}}(X), k)$$

   for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant 2n$.

2. *the same isomorphisms of the previous point are true for X a smooth Stein space of pure dimension n;*

3. *if $|k^\times|$ is a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}_+$ and Y is another smooth rigid dagger spaces, then*

   $$\bigoplus_{n=p+q} H^p_{\mathrm{dR}}(X) \otimes_k H_d R^q(X) \cong H^n_{\mathrm{dR}}(X \times Y).$$

Proof. □

Finally we can restate theorem 5.1 of [33], comparing the cohomology of non-archimedean rigid k-dagger spaces with Berthelot rigid cohomology (see [40]).

We assume $k = \mathrm{Frac}\,(R)$ for a complete discrete valuation ring R of mixed characteristic. If $\mathcal{X}$ is an admissible formal R-scheme with generic fibre X and specialization morphism $s : X \to \mathcal{X}_s$, and if $V \to \mathcal{X}_s$ is a subset of its special fibre, we write $]V[= s^{-1}(V)$. If $j : V \to \mathcal{X}_s$ is an open immersion, we define the functor $j^\dagger$ for the category of abelian shaves over X to itself as

$$\mathscr{F} \mapsto j^\dagger \mathscr{F} = \varinjlim_U (j_U)_* (j_U)^{-1} \mathscr{F}$$

where U runs through the family of strict neighborhoods of $]V[$ in X.

Theorem 6.4.26. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper admissible formal* Spf *R-scheme, $Y \to \mathcal{X}_s$ an immersion into its special fibre with schematic closure $j : Y \to \overline{Y}$ in $\mathcal{X}_s$. Then $]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a partially proper rigid space, therefore equivalent with a rigid dagger space Q. Let X be the open subspace of Q whose underlying set is identified with $]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{X}}$. Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

1. *if $\mathscr{F}$ is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_Q$-module, $\mathscr{F}'$ the associated coherent $\mathcal{O}_{]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{X}}}$-module, then there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$H^q(X, \mathscr{F}_X) \cong H^q(]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{X}}, j^\dagger \widehat{\mathscr{F}}).$$

2. *if X is smooth, there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$H^q_{\mathrm{dR}}(X) \cong H^q(]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{X}}, j^\dagger \Omega^\bullet_{]\overline{Y}[_{\mathcal{X}}}).$$

3. *if X is smooth along Y, there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$H^q_{\mathrm{dR}}(X) \cong H^q_{\mathrm{rig}}(Y/q).$$

Proof. [33]. □

Then, it remains to link our k-dagger analytic spaces with Berkovich k-analytic spaces.

Definition 6.4.27. *Let X be a k-analytic space in the sense of Berkovich. We say that X is* wide *if there exists a net of wide affinoid subdomains $U_i \subset X$ such that*

$$\bigcup_i U_i = X.$$

In particular Stein and partially proper spaces are wide.

Theorem 6.4.28. *There is an equivalence of categories between the category of wide k-analytic spaces in the sense of Berkovich and the wide k-dagger analytic space.*

Proof. As above we can define a functor $\widehat{\cdot} : \mathbf{An}_k^\dagger \to \mathbf{An}_k$. It is clear that it's essential image is the category of wide Berkovich spaces and that this functor is fully faithful. □

Corollary 6.4.29. *There is an equivalence between, the category of wide paracompact strictly k-dagger analytic spaces and the category of partially proper quasiseparated rigid k-dagger spaces that have an admissible dagger affinoid covering of finite type.*

Proof. □

So, this result allows us to recast results of Grösse-Klonne in our settings, which we omit to write explicitly for the sake of brevity.

Finally we sketch so of the main relations with our construction of rigid spaces and Huber theory (see [41]). Mainly we want to describe the "adic spaces" associated to a dagger affinoid space, *i.e.* the sober space associated to its topos. We denote with $\mathcal{H}(A)$ the Huber adic space associated to an affinoid algebra A. Without much surprise we have the following theorem.

Theorem 6.4.30. *Let $A = \varinjlim A_\rho$ be a strict k-dagger affinoid algebra, then*

$$\mathcal{H}(A) = \varprojlim \mathcal{H}(A)$$

where with $\mathcal{H}(A)$ we denote the topos associated to the dagger space $(\mathcal{M}(A), A)$.

Proof. One can check it constructing $\mathcal{H}(A)$ as the set of prime filters of dagger subdomains of $\mathrm{Max}\,(A)$ or equivalently as $\mathrm{Spa}\,(A, A^\circ)$ with respect to the locally convex topology of bornivorous subsets, in analogy with [41] corollaries 4.4 and 4.5. □

Remark 6.4.31. We remark that (necessarily) we have that always $\mathcal{H}(A) \neq \mathcal{H}(\widehat{A})$, except for trivial cases, and clearly $\mathcal{H}(\widehat{A}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}(A)$, for any dagger algebra A. The further points that one finds in $\mathcal{H}(A)$ are given by higher rank points pointing out of the affinoid space. For example considering

$$\mathcal{H}(k\langle T\rangle^\dagger) = \mathcal{M}(A) \cup \{t_\sigma\}$$

where t_σ is the type 5 point attached to the Gauss point of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ and pointing "up", outside the tree.

6.4.2 Complex analytic case

Lemma 6.4.32. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a separated complex analytic space. Any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ has a neighborhood basis made of compact Stein subsets whose algebra of germs of analytic functions is a $\mathbb{C}$-dagger affinoid algebra.*

Proof. By definition each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ has an open neighborhood $x \in U_x$ such that $(U_x, \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}|_{U_x})$ is isomorphic to an affine analytic set and by the separateness hypothesis $\mathcal{X}$ is Hausdorff. Choosing an explicit isomorphism

$$U_x \cong \{z \in U \subset \mathbb{C}^n | f_1(z) = \ldots = f_r(z) = 0, f_1, \ldots, f_r \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n}(U)\} = \tilde{U}_x$$

and denoting by $\tilde{z}$ the image of x in $\tilde{U}_x$ we can choose a basis of closed polydisks $\{D_n\}$ as base of neighborhoods of $\tilde{z}$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then the subsets $\{D_n \cap \tilde{U}_x\}$ are a basis of neighborhoods of $\tilde{z}$ in $\tilde{U}_x$ and are canonically $\mathbb{C}$-dagger affinoid spaces and by separateness of $\mathcal{X}$ this subset are compact Stein in $\mathcal{X}$. □

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a separated complex analytic space. By the previous lemma each point has a basis of neighborhoods made of $\mathbb{C}$-dagger affinoid spaces. And is clear that these induces on $\mathcal{X}$ a good $\mathbb{C}$-dagger analytic space structure.

Definition 6.4.33. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a separated complex analytic space, we denote by $\mathcal{X}^\dagger$ its associated good $\mathbb{C}$-dagger analytic space.*

Lemma 6.4.34. *The construction given so far define a functor from the category of complex analytic spaces to the category of $\mathbb{C}$-dagger analytic spaces.*

Proof. Let $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be a morphism of separated complex analytic spaces, and $U \subset X$ a $\mathbb{C}$-dagger affinoid domain. Then $f(U)$ is contained in a open subset $Z \subset \mathcal{Y}$ such that $(Z, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}|Z)$ is an analytic set. To see this notice that $f(U)$ is compact and so in $\mathcal{Y} = \bigcup_{i\in I} U_i$ then $f(X) \cap U_i$ is an open covering of $f(X)$ which has a finite subcovering. So let's suppose that $U_{i_1}, \ldots, U_{i_n}$ cover $f(U)$ then each U_{i_j} is an analytic subset of some $\mathbb{C}^{m_{i_j}}$ and $f(U)$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{C}^{m_{i_j}}$, so it is totally bounded and hence contained in some bounded polydisk D_{i_j}. So we can embed $f(U) \subset \mathbb{C}^{\max\{m_{i_1},\ldots,m_{i_n}\}}$ and $f(U)$ is contained in a polydisk with the maximum radius of the D_{i_j}. Moreover $U_{i_1}, \ldots, U_{i_n}$ defines a $\mathbb{C}$-dagger analytic subset V of this polydisk which contain $f(U)$. We can take a small enough neighborhood of V as Z. It's clear that $f : U \to V$ is a map of $\mathbb{C}$-dagger affinoid spaces which hence induces a strong morphism of $\mathbb{C}$-dagger analytic spaces. □

Lemma 6.4.35. *The dagger and the complex analytic sheaves agrees on open sets,* i.e. *let $\mathcal{X}$ a complex analytic space and $U \subset \mathcal{X}$ an open set, then*

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(U) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^\dagger}(U).$$

Proof. By definition and the fact that every point has an open neighborhood that is countable at infinity. □

Theorem 6.4.36. *The category of separated analytic spaces over $\mathbb{C}$ embeds fully faithfully in the category of good k-dagger analytic spaces.*

Proof. It remain to show that this functor is fully faithful. $f, g : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be two morphisms which defines the same morphisms of associated $\mathbb{C}$-dagger analytic spaces. This implies that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, f and g defines the same morphisms $f_x, g_x : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y},f(x)} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}$ which agree with local rings of the associated k-dagger analytic space because the associated space to $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are good. And this data define uniquely a morphism of k-dagger analytic spaces. On the other hand any morphism of k-dagger analytic space associated to two complex analytic spaces induces a morphism complex analytic spaces because the dagger G-topology is finer then the complex analytic topology and by previous lemma. □

Remark 6.4.37. The previous inclusion of categories is a strict inclusion. The category of good k-dagger analytic spaces is much bigger, for example no k-dagger affinoid space is a complex analytic space in classical sense because of borders.

Let's give some example of the new features of the spaces we have defined so far.

Example 6.4.38.

1. The real affine line $\mathbb{A}^1_{\mathbb{R}}$ is homeomorphic to the upper half plane of $\mathbb{C}$ with its boundary, the real line $\mathbb{R}$ since it is by definition $\mathbb{C}$ quotiented by the action of complex conjugation. Analogous statement are true for $\mathbb{A}^n_{\mathbb{R}}$.

2. In [28], remark 1.5.5 Berkovich suggested an application of its theory of analytic spaces also in the archimedean case. But, using its theory, he was able to show that one could obtain a topological manifold, which is something which don't lie in the realm of analytic geometry. We can now see how our approach fix this problem. Berkovich considered for $k = \mathbb{C}$ and $n = 2$ in the space "archimedean affinoid space"

$$\mathcal{M}(D^n) \cong \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C} || z_1| \leqslant 1, |z_2| \leqslant 1\}$$

where D^n is the disk algebra of the unitary polydisk in $\mathbb{C}^n$, the subset defined by the equation $X_1X_2 - 1 = 0$, where X_1 and X_2 are coordinates. The as a set

$$X = \mathcal{M}\left(\frac{D^n}{(X_1X_2 - 1)}\right) \cong \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C} || z_1| = 1, |z_2| = 1\}$$

and since D^n contains elements which are continuous on the border and moreover any continuous function on the border of $\mathcal{M}(D^n)$ "induces" a unique analytic function inside the polydisk. Hence the structural sheaf that which X is endowed in this way is the sheaf of continuous function from $X \cong S^1 \to \mathbb{C}$, which is not a space that one would like to study in analytic geometry. On the other hand, the same space considered as dagger affinoid space give

$$X^\dagger = \mathcal{M}\left(\frac{W^n_{\mathbb{C}}}{X_1X_2 - 1}\right) \cong \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C} || z_1| = 1, |z_2| = 1\}$$

so $X^\dagger \cong X$ but on $X^\dagger$ we consider functions that can be extended to an analytic function on a neighborhood of $X^\dagger$ in the hypersurface of $\mathbb{C}^2$ given by the equation $X_1X_2 - 1 = 0$. In this way one can see easily that $X^\dagger$ is isomorphic to the circle of the complex plane equipped with the algebra of functions of the form

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} a_i X^i, \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} |a| < \infty,$$

which is a compact Stein subset of $\mathbb{C}$ and so a meaningful object to study in analytic geometry.

6.4.3 The GAGA principle

In analogy with [28] (section 3.4) we can give the following GAGA principle for good k-dagger analytic spaces.

Definition 6.4.39. *Let X scheme over k of locally finite type. We define the* GAGA functor $X^{\mathrm{an}} : \mathbf{An}^\dagger_k \to \mathbf{Sets}$ *to be the functor*

$$\mathcal{X} \mapsto X^{\mathrm{an}}(X) = \mathrm{Hom}_{k-\mathbf{Rings}}(\mathcal{X}, X)$$

which associate to every k-dagger analytic space $\mathcal{X}$ the set for morphism of k-ringed spaces $\mathcal{X} \to X$.

Theorem 6.4.40. *(GAGA Principle)*
The GAGA functor is represented by a good k-dagger analytic space and a morphism $\pi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to X$ with the following properties:

1. *for any valued field K/k there is a bijection $X^{\mathrm{an}}(K) \cong X(K)$;*
2. *if k is non-archimedean the map π is surjective and induces a bijection $X^{\mathrm{an}}_0 \to X_0$;*
3. *for any point $x \in X^{\mathrm{an}}$ the homomorphism $\pi_x : \mathcal{O}_{X,\pi(x)} \to \mathcal{O}_{X^{\mathrm{an}},x}$ is local and strictly flat;*
4. *if $x \in X^{\mathrm{an}}(\overline{k})$ then $\widehat{\pi}_x : \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\pi(x)} \to \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X^{\mathrm{an}},x}$ is an isomorphism of completions.*

Proof. We first note hat if X^{an} exists, the property 1. and 2. follow easily from the universal property of X^{an}. The construction of X^{an} will be made in several steps.

1. First let's suppose $X = \mathrm{Spec}\,(k[T_1, \ldots, T_n])$. We claim that in this case X^{an} is the n-dimensional dagger affine space we defined so far

$$\mathbb{A}^n_k = \varinjlim_{\rho>0} \mathcal{M}(W^n_k(\rho)).$$

$\mathbb{A}_k^n$ is a good k-dagger analytic space and the functor $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathrm{Hom}_{k-\mathbf{Rings}}(\mathcal{X}, X)$ is represented by $\mathbb{A}_k^n$, because

$$\mathrm{Hom}_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{A}_k^n) \cong \Gamma(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X})^n \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Alg}_k}(k[T], \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{X}))^n \cong$$

$$\cong \mathrm{Hom}_k(\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{X}), \mathrm{Spec}\,(k[T_1, \ldots, T_n]) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_k(\mathcal{X}, X)$$

and the morphism $\pi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to X$ is given by the completion of $k[T_1, \ldots, T_n] \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}_k^n}(\mathbb{A}_k^n)$, with respect to its canonical Fréchet metric.

2. Now suppose that the theorem is valid for a k-scheme X, we show that this implies that its validity for any subscheme $Y \subset X$. Suppose first that Y is an open subscheme of X. The subset $\pi^{-1}(Y)$ is an open subset of X^{an} and the induced dagger analytic structure on $\pi^{-1}(Y)$ satisfy the required universal property.

   Now let's suppose that Y is a closed subscheme of Y and $\mathcal{I}$ the coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-ideal which defines Y. Then extension ideal sheaf $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{O}_{X^{\mathrm{an}}}$ is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{X^{\mathrm{an}}}$-ideal which defines a closed k-dagger analytic subspace which is the k-dagger analytic space associated with Y.

3. From the previous two steps it follows that the theorem is valid for any affine scheme $X = \mathrm{Spec}\,(A)$, where A is a finitely generated ring over k. By standard arguments it follows the theorem for any k-scheme of locally finite type.

Then we are left to show 3. and 4.. Let $\pi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to X$ be the canonical morphism. Since we have to work locally we can suppose that $X = \mathrm{Spec}\,(A)$ where $A = \frac{k[T_1, \ldots, T_n]}{I}$ is a finitely generated k-algebra. For a point $x \in X^{\mathrm{an}}(\overline{k})$, the homomorphism

$$\pi_x : \widehat{A}_{(\pi(x))} = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\pi(x)} \to \mathcal{O}_{X^{\mathrm{an}},x}$$

is an isomorphism by 6.1.10 and the fact that A is dense in $\mathcal{O}_{X^{\mathrm{an}}}(X^{\mathrm{an}})$. It remains to show that π_x is a flat homomorphism for $x \in X^{\mathrm{an}}$. It suffices to show that the ring $\mathcal{O}_{X^{\mathrm{an}},x}$ is flat over A. This is true for all points $x \in X_0^{\mathrm{an}} = X_0$, by the isomorphism $\widehat{\pi}_x$. Hence, the ring $\mathcal{A}_V$ is flat over A for any dagger affinoid subdomain $V \subset X^{\mathrm{an}}$. But $\mathcal{O}_{X^{\mathrm{an}}}(X^{\mathrm{an}}) = \varinjlim \mathcal{A}_V$, where the limit is taken over all dagger affinoid neighborhoods of x in X^{an}. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}_{X^{\mathrm{an}}}(X^{\mathrm{an}})$ is flat over A. □

Remark 6.4.41. If $X = \mathrm{Spec}\,(A)$, where A is a finitely generated ring over k, then X^{an} coincides with the set of all multiplicative seminorms on A whose restriction to k is the norm on k. If X is arbitrary, X^{an} (as a set) can be described as follows. Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote the union $\bigcup X(K)$ over all complete valued fields extensions K/k. The set is endowed with the following equivalence relation. If $x' \in X(K')$ and $x'' \in X(K'')$, then $x' \sim x''$ if there exist a valued field K and embeddings $K \to K'$ and $K \to K''$ such that the points x' and x'' are image of the same point of $X(K)$. Then X^{an} coincides with the set of equivalence classes in $\mathcal{X}$.

Appendix A

The pro-site

A.1 Pro-objects and Ind-objects

Here we recall the definitions of pro and ind objects form [43]. In this section $\mathcal{C}$ denotes a category and $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ the category of presheaves of sets over $\mathcal{C}$, *i.e.* objects of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ are functors $F : \mathcal{C}^\circ \to \mathcal{S}et$ and morphisms are natural transformations between functors.

Definition A.1.1. *A category $\mathcal{C}$ is said* pseudo-filtrant *if*

1. *all diagram of the form*



can be inserted to a commutative diagram of the form



;

2. *all diagram of the form $f, g : i \rightrightarrows j$ can be inserted in a diagram of the form $i \rightrightarrows j \xrightarrow{h} k$ with $h \circ f = h \circ g$.*

A category is said filtrant *if is pseudo-filtrant, non-empty and connected,* i.e. *if any couple of objects can be connected by a sequence of arrows (without imposing any condition on the direction of the arrows). A category $\mathcal{C}$ is said* cofiltant *if $\mathcal{C}^\circ$ is filtrant.*

Remark A.1.2. Beware to the fact that the use of the term filtrant in this context is different of the use done for the systems of seminormed vector space we used to define bornological vector spaces and bornological algebras.

Definition A.1.3. *Let $\phi : I \to I'$ be a functor. We say that ϕ is* cofinal *if for any functor $u : I'^{\circ} \to \mathcal{C}$ the canonical natural transformation $\varprojlim v \to \varprojlim v \circ \phi$ is an isomorphism.*

If $\phi : I \to I'$ is an inclusion of categories we say that I is a cofinal subcategory of I'.

Given two objects $i, j \in \mathrm{ob}\,(I)$ we say that i *is bigger* than j if $\mathrm{Hom}\,(i, j) \neq \varnothing$.

Proposition A.1.4. *Let $\phi : I \to I'$ be a functor then:*

1. *if ϕ is cofinal then for any $j \in \mathrm{ob}\,(I')$ there exist an object $i \in \mathrm{ob}\,(I)$ such that $\phi(i)$ is bigger than j;*
2. *if I is filtrant, then ϕ is cofinal if and only if for any $i \in \mathrm{ob}\,(I)$ and couple of arrow $i' \overset{f,g}{\rightrightarrows} \phi(i)$ in I' there exists an arrow $h : i \to j$ in I such that $\phi(h) \circ f = \phi(h) \circ g$;*
3. *if I' is filtrant and ϕ is fully faithful then ϕ is cofinal if and only if it satisfies condition 1..*

Proof. □

Corollary A.1.5. *Let $\phi : I \to I'$ be a cofinal functor then:*

1. *if I is filtrant then I' is filtrant;*
2. *if I' is filtrant and ϕ fully faithfull then I is filtrant.*

Proof. □

Proposition A.1.6. *(Deligne)*
Let I be a small filtrant category, then there exists a partially ordered set E and a cofinal functor $\phi : \mathcal{E} \to I$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is the category canonically associated to E.

Proof. □

Definition A.1.7. *An* ind-object *(or* inductive system*) of $\mathcal{C}$ is a filtrant functor $\phi : I \to \mathcal{C}$. I is called the* index category *of the system. The category of all ind-objects of $\mathcal{C}$ with system morphisms is denoted by* $\mathbf{Ind}(\mathcal{C})$.

Definition A.1.8. *A* pro-object *(or* projective system*) of $\mathcal{C}$ is a cofiltrant functor $\phi : I^{\circ} \to \mathcal{C}$. I is called the* index category *of the system. The category of all pro-objects of $\mathcal{C}$ with system morphisms is denoted by* $\mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$.

Proposition A.1.9. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category, then $\mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$ admits small filtered projective limits. If $\mathcal{C}$ admits pullbacks then also $\mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$ admits pullbacks.*

Proof. □

Proposition A.1.10. *There is a canonical fully faithful functor $L : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$ (the Yoneda functor) which commutes with pullbacks but not in general with small filtered projective limits.*

Proof. □

We recall that a site is a category $\mathcal{C}$ equipped with a Grothendieck topology and that to any site we can associate its category of sheaves of sets $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ which is defined to be the full subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ defined by objects $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\widehat{\mathcal{C}})$ such that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}(X, \mathscr{F}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}(R, \mathscr{F})$$

for any covering sieve of $\mathcal{C}$ over any $X \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathcal{C})$. If the topology of $\mathcal{C}$ is given by a pretopology this is equivalent to the usual exact sequence condition in the definition of sheaves. We recall also that the inclusion functor $i : \widetilde{\mathcal{C}} \to \widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ has an adjoint functor, denoted $\overline{a} : \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ which associate to any presheaf a sheaf. We underline also that the functor $\overline{a}$ is exact.

We also need the following proposition from [43], exposé II.

Proposition A.1.11. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category and $\mathbf{F} = \{\mathscr{F}_i\}_{i\in I}$ a family of presheaves over $\mathcal{C}$. Denoting, for all object $X \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathcal{C})$, with $J_{\mathbf{F}}(X)$ the class of sieves $R \to X$ such that for any morphism $Y \to X$ of $\mathcal{C}$ with codomain X, the sieve $R \times_X Y$ has the following property: the map*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}(Y, \mathscr{F}_i) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}(R \times_X Y, \mathscr{F}_i)$$

is bijective (resp. injective) for all $i \in I$. Then the $J_{\mathbf{F}}(X)$ define a topology on $\mathcal{C}$, which is the finest topology such that all $\mathscr{F}_i$ are sheaves (resp. a separable presheaves).

Proof. □

A.2 The pro-site and pro-analytic spaces

Let k be a complete valued field. It is well known that to k is possible to associate a category $\mathbf{An}_k$ of analytic spaces over k. If k is archimedean the construction is classical, and we are mainly interested in the case where $k = \mathbb{C}$. If k is non-archimedean there are different possible choices for the definiton of what $\mathbf{An}_k$ is. At least there are the following choices: classical rigid analytic spaces, Berkovich analytic spaces and Huber adic spaces. In our work we were mainly interested on Berkovich non-archimedan space so we work with this category, but what we says in this appendix can be recasted in any setting with suitable adaptations. In particular when we talk about open subsets of some analytic space we refer to the open sets of the topological spaces underlying the Berkovich space and not to the admissible opens for the G-topology of analytic domains over it.

Definition A.2.1. *We call an object of $\mathbf{Pro}(\mathbf{An}_k)$ a k-*pro-analytic space*.*

$\mathbf{Pro}(\mathbf{An}_k)$ is a complete category because $\mathbf{An}_k$ admits fiber products.

Now, $\mathbf{An}_k \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Pro}(\mathbf{An}_k)$ in a fully faithful way and so any analytic space over k can be seen as a pro-analytic space. But in this new category we will have much more objects that have an "open immersion" into objects of $\mathbf{An}_k$. We will describe them as "pro-opens" subset, similarly of what is done in [35]. So, in some sense the inclusion $\mathbf{An}_k \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Pro}(\mathbf{An}_k)$ enhance the concept of open subspace.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a site and $\mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$ the pro-category of $\mathcal{C}$. For any sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on $\mathcal{C}$ we can define a presheaf of $\mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$ in the following way

$$\pi^{-1}(\mathscr{F})(U) = \pi^{-1}(\mathscr{F})(\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} U_i) \doteq \varinjlim \mathscr{F}(U_i).$$

We want to put in a canonical way a topology on $\mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$ such that all the presheaves obtained in this way are sheaves, hence the following definition.

Definition A.2.2. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a site we denote with $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ the category $\mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$ endowed with the finer topology such that all presheaves of the form $\pi^{-1}(\mathscr{F})$ for $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}})$ are sheaves and call it the* pro-site *of $\mathcal{C}$ and its topology the* pro-topology *of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{Pro}}$.*

Remark A.2.3. From proposition A.1.11 follows that the definition of the pro-site is well posed.

Proposition A.2.4. *There is a canonical morphism of topos* $(\pi_*, \pi^{-1}) : \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ *for any site* $\mathcal{C}$*, where*

$$\pi_* \mathscr{F}(X) = \mathscr{F}(\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i)$$

where $X \in \mathcal{C}$ *and* $\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i$ *is the trivial system with* $X_i = X$ *and morphisms equal to the identity.*

Proof. The functors π^{-1} clearly exact, hence we have to check that (π_*, π^{-1}) is an adjoint pair, *i.e.* that given any sheaves $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}})$ and $\mathscr{G} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{Pro}})$ then

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{Pro}}}(\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}}(\mathscr{F}, \pi_*\mathscr{G}).$$

Any map $\phi : \pi^{-1}\mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{G}$ induces a morphism $\mathscr{F} \to \pi_*\mathscr{G}$ simply by restricting ϕ to trivial projective systems. On the other hand given any map $\phi : \mathscr{F} \to \pi_*\mathscr{G}$, for any $\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i$ we can define canonically the map

$$\varinjlim \phi_{\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i} : \pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}(\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i) \to \pi^{-1}\pi_*\mathscr{G}(\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i)$$

because $\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}(\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i) = \varinjlim \mathscr{F}(X_i)$ and $\pi^{-1}\pi_*\mathscr{G}(\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i) = \varinjlim \mathscr{G}(X_i)$. So, there is a canonical morphism

$$\varinjlim \mathscr{G}(X_i) \to \mathscr{G}(\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i)$$

by mean of which we get the required morphism of sheaves $\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{G}$. □

Proposition A.2.5. *For any* $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}})$ *the canonical morphism* $\mathscr{F} \to \pi_*\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}$ *is an isomorphisms, so in particular* π^{-1} *is fully faithful.*

Proof. For any $C \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathcal{C})$ the morphism $\mathscr{F}(C) \to \pi_*\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}(C)$ is by definition an isomorphism. π^{-1} is clearly fully faithful because to give a morphism between two objects $\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}})$ is equivalent to give a morphism between $\pi^{-1}\mathscr{F}$ and $\pi^{-1}\mathscr{G}$. □

Let now $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a ringed site. By mean of the canonical morphism $\pi : X_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to X$ we can pullback the structural sheaf $\mathcal{O}_X$ to a sheaf of rings $\pi^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X$ on $X_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ which in this way can be equipped canonically with a structure of ringed site, and the morphism $\pi : X_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to X$ becomes a morphism of ringed sites and moreover $(\pi_*, \pi^{-1}) : \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ a morphism of ringed topoi.

The association $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbf{Pro}(\mathcal{C})$ is functorial in the category of all categories. In fact if $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is a functor then for any $\mathcal{C}$-pro-object $\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i$ we can associated the $\mathcal{D}$-pro-object $\text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} F(X_i)$ and moreover given a morphism $f : \text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} X_i \to \text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} Y_j$ then we can associate to it the morphism $Ff : \text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} F(X_i) \to \text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} F(Y_j)$, because f is a morphism of system hence is defined by morphisms of $\mathcal{C}$.

Proposition A.2.6. *Suppose that both* $\mathcal{C}$ *and* $\mathcal{D}$ *admits fiber products and that* $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ *is a morphism of sites. Then* f *induces a morphism* $f_{\mathbf{Pro}} : \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{Pro}}$*.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{C}$ has fiber products every Grothendieck topology on $\mathcal{C}$ can be defined by a pretopology, see [43]. A family of morphisms $\{U_i \to U\}$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ is a covering if and only if for every sheaf over $\mathcal{C}$ the sequence

$$\pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}\mathscr{F}(U) \to \prod_i \pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}\mathscr{F}(U_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}\mathscr{F}(U_i \times_U U_j)$$

is exact. And by definition of the pullback $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}$ this is equivalent to the exactness of

$$\varinjlim_k \mathscr{F}(W_k) \to \prod_i \varinjlim_j \mathscr{F}(V_{i,j}) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \varinjlim_k \mathscr{F}(V_{i,k} \times_{W_k} V_{j,k})$$

where $U = \text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} W_k$ and $U_i = \text{“}\varprojlim\text{”} V_{i,j}$.

Let $\overline{f} : \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{C}$ be the continuous functor associated to f. As remarked so far, $\overline{f}$ induces a functor $\overline{f}_{\mathbf{Pro}} : \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{Pro}} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{Pro}}$, and since f is continuous for any covering $\{U_i \to U\}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ the family $\{\overline{f}(U_i) \to \overline{f}(U)\}$ is a covering of $\mathcal{D}$. Let $\{U_i \to U\}$ be a covering in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ and $\mathscr{F} \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}})$, then the equivalence of

$$\pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}\mathscr{F}(\overline{f}_{\mathbf{Pro}}(U)) \to \prod_i \pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}\mathscr{F}(\overline{f}_{\mathbf{Pro}}(U_i)) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}\mathscr{F}(\overline{f}_{\mathbf{Pro}}(U_i) \times_{\overline{f}_{\mathbf{Pro}}(U)} \overline{f}_{\mathbf{Pro}}(U_j))$$

is equivalent to the exactness of

$$\varinjlim_k (\pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}\mathscr{F})(\overline{f}(W_k)) \to \prod_i \varinjlim_j (\pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}\mathscr{F})(\overline{f}(V_{i,j})) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \varinjlim_k (\pi_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}\mathscr{F})(\overline{f}(V_{i,k}) \times_{\overline{f}(W_k)} \overline{f}(V_{j,k}))$$

which is equivalent to

$$\varinjlim_k (\pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1} f^{-1}(\mathscr{F}))(W_k) \to \prod_i \varinjlim_j (\pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1} f^{-1}(\mathscr{F}))(V_{i,j}) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \varinjlim_k (\pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1} f^{-1}(\mathscr{F}))(V_{i,k} \times_{W_k} V_{j,k})$$

which is exact by the definition of pro-site.

Finally the pullback functor $f_{\mathbf{Pro}}^{-1}$ is exact by the relation $f_{\mathbf{Pro}}^{-1} = \pi_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1} f^{-1}(\pi_{\mathcal{D}})_*$. □

Let's see how the above definitions specialize in the case of topological and ringed and G-ringed spaces.

Proposition A.2.7. *If X is a T_1 topological spaces then there is an inclusion functor $\mathscr{P}(X) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Pro}(\mathbf{Ouv}(X))$.*

Proof. If X is T_1 points are closed. This mean that given any subset $S \subset X$ and any open neighborhood $U \subset X$ of S and any finite sets of points $s_1, \ldots, s_n \in X - S$ the set $U - \{s_1, \ldots, s_n\}$ is open in X. So this proves that the intersection of the system of neighborhoods of S is equal to S, which is therefore a "pro-open" set. □

Example A.2.8.

1. Let's consider the Zariski site on $\mathrm{Max}\,(\mathbb{C}[T])$ and $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C} || z| \leqslant 1\} \subset \mathrm{Max}\,(\mathbb{C}[T]) \cong \mathbb{C}$. Since the Zariski topology on $\mathbb{C}$ is T_1, then D is a pro-open set and $\mathcal{O}_{Zar}^{\mathbf{Pro}}(D)$ coincides with the rational functions in $\mathbb{C}(T)$ with poles outside D.

2. Pro-analytic site of a complex analytic space gives a systematic way to deal with the operation of taking germs of analytic functions, as we are doing with our dagger algebras.

3. Another interesting example, not linked with the scope of this thesis, is the application of the construction of the pro-site to the étale site of the category of schemes or over the étale site over a scheme. In fact there is already in literature a construction called the "pro-étale" site, see [51] for an introduction to the topic. In particular by the results of section 17 of [51], we see that there is a canonical morphism of sites from the pro-site of the étale site and the classical notion of pro-étale site.

4. Let's consider the topological space $X = [0,1]$. The subintervals $[0, \frac{1}{n}], \ldots, [\frac{n-1}{n}, n]$ form an admissible covering for the pro-site topology on $X_{\mathbf{Pro}}$. This is due to the fact that $\varinjlim$ is an exact functor. This explains in a general way why different construction scattered in literature have to required some finiteness conditions on the coverings: compact Stein site, rigid weak G-topology, the dagger site we discussed in this thesis for example. The requirement of finiteness on covering is necessary because $\varinjlim$ is exact and don't commutes in general, with limits as the following example shows. Let's consider again $X = [0,1]$. Since X is Hausdorff any subset of X is pro-open and so we can cover X with the following covering

$$\bigcup_{x \in [0,1]} \{x\} = [0,1].$$

All the subset $\{x\}$ are admissible opens but is easy to see that the covering is not an admissible covering for the topology of $X_{\mathbf{Pro}}$.

Definition A.2.9. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a morphisms of pro-analytic spaces. We say that f is an* open immersion *if f is injective and if is an isomorphisms on stalks.*

The previous definition express formally one of the remarks we started this section: the site $(\mathbf{An}_k)_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ enhances the concept of open subspace. This is precisely the phenomena we studied in chapter five and six where we used germs of analytic functions to construct our dagger analytic spaces and we used some sort of G-topology to admit as open subsets some subsets of a topological spaces which where not open for the given topology. Then, putting on these subsets the germs of analytic functions we worked on a site which naturally lie between $(\mathbf{An}_k)_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ and $\mathbf{An}_k$ which we denoted $\mathbf{An}_k^{\dagger}$.

Finally we remark that $(\mathbf{An}_k)_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ is equivalent to the category of germs of analytic spaces defined by Berkovich. The difference is that we put on $(\mathbf{An}_k)_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ a natural topology induced by $(\mathbf{An}_k)_{\mathbf{Pro}}$ and consider it as a site, not only as a bare category.

It seems that is worth to study these notions in more details in the future and their relations between other known notions like the pro-étale site, that we had no time to do here.

Appendix B

Generalized rings of Durov

This section is a recall of the work of Durov thesis [45]. We recall here the definition and results that are used in this thesis and add some remark in the final part of the appendix.

Definition B.0.10. *A* monad *over a category* $\mathbf{C}$ *is a triple* $\Sigma = (\Sigma, \mu, \epsilon)$ *where* $\Sigma : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ *is an endofunctor,* $\mu : \Sigma^2 \longrightarrow \Sigma$ *(where* Σ^2 *denote the composition* $\Sigma \circ \Sigma$*),* $\epsilon : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \longrightarrow \Sigma$ *are natural transformations called* multiplication *and* identity*, such that* μ *and* ϵ *respect the axioms of associativity and of unit* i.e. *for any* $X \in \mathrm{ob}(\mathbf{C})$ *the following diagrams*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma^3(X) & \xrightarrow{\Sigma(\mu_X)} & \Sigma^2(X) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mu_{\Sigma(X)}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mu_X} \\ \Sigma^2(X) & \xrightarrow{\mu_X} & \Sigma(X) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} \Sigma(X) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{\Sigma(X)}} & \Sigma^2(X) & \xleftarrow{\Sigma(\epsilon_X)} & \Sigma(X) \\ & \searrow^{\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma(X)}} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mu_X} & \swarrow_{\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma(X)}} & \\ & & \Sigma(X) & & \end{array},$$

commutes.

A morphism of monads over $\mathbf{C}$*,* $\varphi : \Sigma_1 \longrightarrow \Sigma_2$ *is a natural transformation between the endofunctor which defines* Σ_1 *and* Σ_2 *such that*

$$\varphi_Y \circ \Sigma_1(f) = \Sigma_2(f) \circ \varphi_X, \quad \varphi_X \circ \epsilon_{\Sigma_1,X} = \epsilon_{\Sigma_2,X} \quad \textit{and}$$
$$\mu_{\Sigma_2,X} \circ \Sigma_2(\varphi_X) \circ \varphi_{\Sigma_1(X)} = \varphi_X \circ \mu_{\Sigma_1,X} = \mu_{\Sigma_2,X} \circ \varphi_{\Sigma_2(X)} \circ \Sigma_1(\varphi_X)$$

for each couple $X, Y \in \mathrm{ob}(\mathbf{C})$ *and all morphisms* $f : X \longrightarrow Y$*. We can restate the last conditions with the request of the following diagrams to commute*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_1(X) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_X} & \Sigma_2(X) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \Sigma_1(f)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \Sigma_2(f)} \\ \Sigma_1(Y) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_Y} & \Sigma_2(Y) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & X & \\ {\scriptstyle \epsilon_{\Sigma_1,X}}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle \epsilon_{\Sigma_2,X}} \\ \Sigma_1(X) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_X} & \Sigma_2(X) \end{array},$$



.

The class of all monads over $\mathbf{C}$ is therefore endowed with a structure of category and is denoted by $\mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{C})$.

Definition B.0.11. $\mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{Sets})$ *has an initial object, the identity functor, which is denoted by* $\mathbb{F}_\varnothing$ *and called* the field without elements.

We recall this definition of category theory.

Definition B.0.12. *Let* $F : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{Sets}$ *be a functors. We says that* $G : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{Sets}$ *is a* sub-functor *of* F*, denoted by* $G \subset F$*, if*

1. *for all* $X \in \mathrm{ob}(\mathbf{C})$*,* $G(X) \subset F(X)$ *and*
2. *for every morphism* $f : X \longrightarrow Y$*,* $G(f) = F(f)_{|G(X)}$.

So, we can go on with our exposition of the theory of monads.

Definition B.0.13. *Let* $\Sigma \in \mathrm{ob}(\mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{Sets}))$*. A* sub-monad Σ' *of* Σ *is a subfunctor* $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma$ *stable for* μ *and* ϵ, i.e. *a monad* Σ' *such that*

1. $\Sigma'(X) \subset \Sigma(X)$ *for all* $X \in \mathrm{ob}(\mathbf{Sets})$*;*
2. *the natural transformation* $\Sigma' \longrightarrow \Sigma$ *induced by the inclusion is a morphism of monads.*

Given two submonads $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset \Sigma$, one defines the intersection as the fiber product:

$$\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2 \doteq \Sigma_1 \times_\Sigma \Sigma_2.$$

Definition B.0.14. *An endofunctor* $\Sigma : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{C}$ *is said* algebraic *if it commutes with filtered colimits. A monad* $\Sigma = (\Sigma, \mu, \epsilon)$ *over* $\mathbf{C}$ *is said* algebraic *if the functor* Σ *is algebraic.*

The composition of two algebraic functors is an algebraic functor and an algebraic functor $\Sigma : \mathbf{Sets} \to \mathbf{Sets}$ is uniquely determined by its value on the subcategory of finite sets, since any set is isomorphic to the direct limit of its finite subsets.

Notation B.0.15. Let's denote by $\underline{\mathbb{N}}$ the full subcategory of **Sets** formed by the *standard finite sets i.e.* the sets $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, we denote objects of $\underline{\mathbb{N}}$ by bold letter like $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}$.

For what we said, the restriction $\Sigma \mapsto \Sigma|_{\underline{\mathbb{N}}}$ defines an equivalence of categories between the category of algebraic endofunctor over **Sets** and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Cat}}(\underline{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbf{Sets})$.

Henceforth all our monads are defined over **Sets**, if not differently stated.

Notation B.0.16. Let $\Sigma \in \mathrm{ob}\,(\mathbf{Mon}\,(\mathbf{Sets}))$ be an algebraic. We denote:

1. $|\Sigma| \doteq \Sigma(\mathbf{1})$ and call it *the underlying monoid* of Σ;
2. $\|\Sigma\| \doteq \coprod_{\mathbf{n}\in\underline{\mathbb{N}}} \Sigma(\mathbf{n})$;
3. we call an element $t \in \Sigma(\mathbf{n})$ an *n-ary operation.*

Let us recall that the data of an algebraic monad Σ is equivalent to the following set of data:

1. A collection of sets $\{\Sigma(n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and maps $\Sigma(\phi) : \Sigma(m) \to \Sigma(n)$, defined for any map $\phi : \mathbf{m} \to \mathbf{n}$, subject to conditions $\Sigma(\mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{n}}) = \mathrm{id}_{\Sigma(n)}$ and $\Sigma(\psi \circ \phi) = \Sigma(\psi) \circ \Sigma(\phi)$.

2. A collection of "multiplication" or "evaluation" maps $\mu_n^{(k)} : \Sigma(k) \times \Sigma(n)^k \to \Sigma(n)$, subject to conditions $\mu_n^{(k)} \circ (\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma(k)} \times \Sigma(n)^{\phi}) = \mu_n^{(k')} \circ (\Sigma(\phi) \times \mathrm{id}_{\Sigma(n)^{k'}})$ for any $\phi : \mathbf{k} \to \mathbf{k}'$, and $\mu_n^{(k)} \circ (\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma(k)} \times \Sigma(\psi)^k) = \mu_m^{(k)}$ for any $\psi : \mathbf{m} \to \mathbf{n}$. We write $[t]_{\Sigma(\mathbf{n})}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k) = t(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k)$ instead of $\mu_n^{(k)}(t; x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k)$ for any $t \in \Sigma(k)$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \Sigma(n)$. In this case the above requirements can be rewritten as

$$\phi_*(t)(x_1, \ldots, x_{k'}) = t(x_{\phi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\phi(k)})$$

and

$$\psi_* \left(t(x_1, \ldots, x_k)\right) = t(\psi_* x_1, \ldots, \psi_* x_k).$$

3. An element $\mathbf{e} \in \Sigma(1)$, called the *identity* of Σ such that $\mathbf{e}(x) = x$ for any $x \in X$.

4. Similarly, a pre-action $\alpha : \Sigma(X) \to X$ is given by a collection of maps $\alpha^{(n)} : \Sigma(n) \times X^n \to X$, subject to analogous relation to the point 2., and we will write $[t]_\alpha(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = [t]_X(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ instead of $\alpha^{(n)}(t; x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Notice that $\mu_X : \Sigma^2(X) \to \Sigma(X)$ defines a pre-action of Σ on $\Sigma(X)$, so the notation $[t]_{\Sigma(X)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ makes sense for any $t \in \Sigma(n)$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \Sigma(X)$. If we take $X = \mathbf{n}$, we recover again the maps $\mu_n^{(k)}$, so the notation $[t]_{\Sigma(n)}$ is consistent.

So the data of an algebraic monad is equivalent to the data of an unordered cosimplicial object with the added structure of the identity and multiplication maps.

Let Σ be an algebraic monad and $U \subset ||\Sigma||$, one can consider the smallest submonad of Σ containing U, *i.e.* the intersection of the family of submonads Σ_α of Σ which contains U, and denote it by

$$\mathbb{F}_\varnothing\langle U\rangle \doteq \bigcap_{U\subset\|\Sigma_\alpha\|} \Sigma_\alpha.$$

Proposition B.0.17. *Let $U \subset ||\Sigma||$ be a subset of a monad Σ. Then $\Sigma' := \mathbb{F}_\varnothing\langle U\rangle$ is the submonad of Σ such that the sets $\Sigma'(\mathbf{n})$ can be obtained applying a finite number of times the following rules:*

1. *$\{k\}_{\mathbf{n}} \in \Sigma'(\mathbf{n})$ for all $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n$.*
2. *(Replacement property) Let $u \in U$ be a k-operation. Then, for all $t_1, \ldots, t_k \in \Sigma'(\mathbf{n})$, it has*

$$[u]_{\Sigma(\mathbf{n})}(t_1, \ldots, t_k) \in \Sigma'(\mathbf{n}).$$

Proof. □

We can generalize the previous definition in the following way. Let $\rho : \Sigma_0 \longrightarrow \Sigma$ be a morphism of monads and $U \subset \|\Sigma\|$, one calls the *sub-monad generated by* U *over* Σ_0 the monad

$$\Sigma_0\langle U\rangle = \mathbb{F}_{\varnothing}\langle U \cup ||\rho(\Sigma_0)||\rangle.$$

Definition B.0.18. *Let $\rho : \Sigma_0 \longrightarrow \Sigma$ be a morphism of monads. An algebraic monad Σ is said of* finite type *over Σ_0 if there exists a finte set U de $\|\Sigma\|$ such that $\Sigma = \Sigma_0\langle U\rangle$.*

A monad is said absolutely of finite type *if it is of finite type over $\mathbb{F}_{\varnothing}$.*

Definition B.0.19. *Let Σ be an algebraic monad. Two operation $t \in \Sigma(\mathbf{n})$ and $s \in \Sigma(\mathbf{m})$ are said to* commute *if for any Σ-module X and any $x_{i,j} \in X^{nm}$, with $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m$ we have*

$$s(t(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{n,1}), \cdots, t(x_{1,m}, \cdots, x_{n,m})) = t(s(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,m}), \cdots, s(x_{m,1}, \cdots, x_{m,n})).$$

An algebraic monad monad is said commutative *if any couple of elements of $\|\Sigma\|$ commutes.*

A commutative algebraic monad over **Sets** *is called a* generalized ring *(in Durov terminology).*

B.1 Monads given by multiplicative submonoids of rings

We recall the following construction from [45], 4.3.8 and 5.1.3.

Definition B.1.1. *Let X be a set we define the* absolute endomorphism ring *of X as the monad* $\mathrm{End}[X]$ *as the following algebraic monad:*

$$\mathrm{End}[X](\mathbf{n}) \doteq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Sets}}(X^n, X), \mathbf{e}_{\mathrm{End}[X]} = \mathrm{Id}_X \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Sets}}(X, X)$$

with the multiplication maps

$$\mu_n^{(k)} : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Sets}}(X^k, X) \times \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Sets}}(X^n, X)^k \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Sets}}(X^n, X)$$

as the usual composition of maps.

Remark B.1.2. Let Σ be an algebraic monad. To give an action $\alpha : \Sigma(X) \to X$ of Σ on X is equivalent to give a morphism of monads $\rho : \Sigma \to \mathrm{End}[X]$.

Definition B.1.3. *Let X be a set and $Y \subset X$. We define the* relative endomorphism ring of Y in X *as the monad* $\mathrm{End}_X[Y]$ *given by the submonad of* $\mathrm{End}[X]$ *of all the maps that stabilize Y,* i.e.

$$\mathrm{End}_X[Y](\mathbf{n}) \doteq \{f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{Sets}}(X^n, X) | f(Y^n) \subset Y\}.$$

It is readily verified that $\mathrm{End}_X[Y]$ is a submonad of $\mathrm{End}[X]$ cause the property of stabilize Y is preserved by composition of maps.

This definition is equivalent to the following, more explicit.

Definition B.1.4. *Let A be a ring and $M \subset A$ be a multiplicative submonoid of A with $0 \in M$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define*

$$\mathcal{R}^n(M) \doteq \left\{ (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in A^n | \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \in M, \forall x_i \in M \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}(M) \doteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{R}^n(M).$$

We associate to M the functor $\Sigma_M \in \mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{Sets})$ by taking finite linear combinations of the form

$$\Sigma_M(X) = \left\{ \sum_{x\in X} m_x x | x \in X, (m_x) \in \mathcal{R}(M) \right\}.$$

We also define the map $\epsilon_X : X \to X$ to be the identity and $\mu_X : \Sigma_M(\Sigma_M(X)) \to \Sigma_M(X)$ as

$$\mu_X \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \mu_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i,j} x_i \right) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \mu_j \lambda_{i,j} \right) x_i.$$

Notice that the map μ is well defined cause for any n we have that $\mathcal{R}^n(M) \subset M^n$, cause $0, 1 \in M$ and so $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(M)$ implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i \in M,$$

for any $(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in M^n$. And choosing $(1, 0, \cdots, 0), (0, 1, 0, \cdots, 0), \cdots, (0, \cdots, 1)$ we see that $\lambda_i \in M$. Hence in the formula of the composition we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \mu_j \lambda_{i,j} \in M$$

cause $(\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_m) \in \mathcal{R}^m(M)$ and $\lambda_{i,j} \in M$ for any i, j.

Remark B.1.5. The sets $\mathcal{R}^n(M) \subset M^n$ are ideals of M^n equipped with the direct product monoid structure. Indeed if $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(M)$, $(a_1, ..., a_n) \in M^n$ and $(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in M^n$ then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i a_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i (a_i x_i) \in M,$$

hence $(\lambda_1 a_1, \cdots, \lambda_n a_n) \in \mathcal{R}^n(M)$.

Proposition B.1.6. *For a multiplicative monoid in a ring $M \subset A$ the triple defined above $(\Sigma_M, \mu, \epsilon)$ is an algebraic monad over the category of sets.*

Proof. The only non-trivial fact to check is that μ_X satisfies the associativity law. But this follow straight from definitions and some calculations. We have to check that given $\alpha \in \Sigma_M^3(X)$ then holds is the equality

$$(\mu_X \circ \mu_{\Sigma_M(X)})(\alpha) = (\mu_X \circ \Sigma_M(\mu_X))(\alpha).$$

Elements of $\Sigma_M^3(X)$ are of the form

$$\sum_{l=1}^{p} \sigma_l \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \mu_{j,l} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i,j,l} x_i \right) \right) = \alpha.$$

So,

$$\mu_{\Sigma_M(X)}(\alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{p} \sigma_l \mu_{j,l} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i,j,l} x_i \right)$$

and

$$(\mu_X \circ \mu_{\Sigma_M(X)})(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{p} \sigma_l \mu_{j,l} \lambda_{i,j,l} \right) \right) x_i.$$

On the other hand,

$$\Sigma_M(\mu_X)(\alpha) = \sum_{l=1}^{p} \sigma_l \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \mu_{j,l} \lambda_{i,j,l} \right) x_i \right)$$

$$(\mu_X \circ \Sigma_M(\mu_X))(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{p} \sigma_l \mu_{j,l} \lambda_{i,j,l} \right) \right) x_i.$$

The algebricity is also straight from definition cause only finite sums are involved. □

Proposition B.1.7. *Let A, B be a commutative rings and $M_A \subset A, M_B \subset B$ and a morphism of rings $f : A \to B$ such that $f(M_A) \subset M_B$ then there is a commutative diagram of monads morphisms*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_A & \xrightarrow{f} & \Sigma_B \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \Sigma_{M_A} & \xrightarrow{f^\circ} & \Sigma_{M_B} \end{array}$$

if and only if M_B is a Σ_{M_A}-module.

Proof. If M_B is a Σ_{M_A}, then $\sum f(\lambda_i)x_i \in M_B$ for every $(\lambda_i) \in \Sigma_{M_A}(\mathbf{n})$ hence the mapping $(\lambda_i) \mapsto (f(\lambda_i))$ defines a map $\Sigma_{M_A}(\mathbf{n}) \to \Sigma_{M_B}(\mathbf{n})$ which induces a map of monads cause f is a ring homomorphism.

On the other hand, if we have a commutative diagram as above the induced map of monads $\Sigma_{M_A} \to \Sigma_{M_B}$ gives to M_B the structure of Σ_{M_A}-modules, cause as in the ring case Σ_{M_B} can be seen naturally as a Σ_{M_A}-module and hence any Σ_{M_B}-module becomes automatically a Σ_{M_A}-module. □

Example B.1.8. We note that can happen that M_B is not a a Σ_{M_A}-modules. If we consider $M_A = \{0\}$, then $\Sigma_{M_A}(\mathbf{n}) = A^n$ for all $n \geqslant 1$. Hence a Σ_{M_A}-submodule of A is equivalent to an ideal, so if we consider $\mathrm{Id} : A \to A = B$ the only monad for which we can complete the square as above are $M_B = 0$ or $M_B = A$.

Appendix C

The bornology of coefficientwise convergence

Let R be a bornological ring and $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ the ring of formal power-series on R. We will introduce a bornology on $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ (analogous to the topology of coefficientwise convergence defined in [9]) with the purpose to use it in the chapter 3 to prove some properties of our dagger algebras.

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}^n$ let's denote the map $\pi_k : R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \to R$ defined

$$\pi_k(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_i X^i) = a_k.$$

This is an R-linear map of R-modules. We can take the R-modulus homomorphism

$$\pi : \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n} \pi_v : R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \to R^{\mathbb{N}^n}$$

and consider on $R^{\mathbb{N}^n}$ the product bornology. Moreover, on $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ we can canonically put the biggest bornology which makes the map π bounded, and with this bornology π becomes an isomorphism of bornological modules. We call it the *bornology of coefficientwise boundedness* on $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$.

Proposition C.0.9. *Let R be a bornological ring and equip $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ with the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness, then $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ is a bornological ring.*

Proof. On $R^{\mathbb{N}^n}$ sum and product by scalars are bounded operations and $\pi : R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \to R^{\mathbb{N}^n}$ is an isomorphism of R-modules, hence, since we pulled back on $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ the direct product bornology, also the addition and scalar product on $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ are bounded. We have to check that the algebra multiplication of $R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ is a bounded map.

Let

$$\mu : R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \times R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \to R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$$

denote the mutiplication map. By the bornological identification $R^{\mathbb{N}^n} \cong R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ of modules we have to check that the map

$$\pi \circ \mu : R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \times R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \to R^{\mathbb{N}^n}$$

is bounded, which is true if and only if all maps

$$\pi_k \circ \mu : R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \times R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \to R$$

are bounded. Given $f, g \in R[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$, with $f = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}^n} a_j X^j, g = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}^n} b_j X^j$ then

$$\pi_k \circ \mu(f, g) = \sum_{i+j=k} \pi_i(f)\pi_j(g) = \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j$$

which is a finite composition of the multiplication and addition maps of R, which are bounded, hence $\pi_k \circ \mu$ is bounded. □

Specializing the result when k is a valued field, we obtain.

Proposition C.0.10. *$k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ with the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness is a bornological algebra of convex type.*

Proof. $k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ is a bornological algebra as seen before. It is of convex type since it is the direct product of bornological vector spaces of convex type and the category of bornological vector space of convex type is complete. □

We will now recall a construction done by Grauert-Remmert in [9]. In [9] for any $\rho = (\rho_1, ..., \rho_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ is defined the algebra

$$B_\rho = \left\{ \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}^n} a_i X^i | \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}^n} |a_i|\rho^i < \infty \right\} \subset k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$$

for any complete valued field, archimedean or not. In this case the summation symbol mean in any case the sum of real number, and is not what we want. So, we will change a little the definition and take

$$B_\rho = k\langle \rho^{-1} X \rangle,$$

where now we assume to use our conventions on additions on $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$. Now, following [9], we call the algebra

$$\varinjlim_{\rho>0} B_\rho = K_n$$

the n-dimensional *stellen algebra* on k. We know that B_ρ are canonically k-Banach algebras, hence K_n becomes naturally a complete bornological algebra of with well defined spectrum equipping it with the direct limit bornology.

Definition C.0.11. *We define the* bornology of coefficientwise boundedness *on K_n as the bornology induced by the inclusion $K_n \subset k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$, giving to $k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness.*

It is well known that K_n is a local Noetherian algebra. We need to recall the following conseguence of Krull intersection theorem.

Lemma C.0.12. *Let A be a Noetherian local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ and $J, I \subset A$ two proper ideals of A with $J \neq 0$ then if $I \subset J + \mathfrak{m}^e$ for all $e \geqslant 1$ then $I \subset J$.*

Proof. By Krull intersection lemma we know that there exist a $k \geqslant 1$ such that $\mathfrak{m}^k \subset J$ then for all $e \geqslant k$ we have that $J + \mathfrak{m}^e = J$ hence

$$I \subset J + \mathfrak{m}^e, \forall e \geqslant 1 \Rightarrow I \subset \bigcap_{e\geqslant 1} (J + \mathfrak{m}^e) = J.$$

□

Proposition C.0.13. *Every ideal of $K_n \subset k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ is closed for the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness.*

Proof. We saw previously that to say that a subspace of a bornological vector space $F \subset E$ is closed is the same to say that for all sequences $\{f_n\} \subset F$, with a bornlogical limit in E, the limit $\lim f_n \in F$. Let $\{f_n\} \subset I \subset K_n$ be a sequence of elements contained in an ideal of K_n which converges bornologically to an element $f = \lim f_n$. Since $\alpha_e : K_n \to \frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e}$ are bounded maps then all the sequences $\alpha_e(f_n)$ are convergent in $\frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e} \cong k^{\binom{n+e-1}{e-1}}$ and since $\frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e}$ is finite dimensional and equipped with the canonical bornology (*i.e.* the direct product bornology) we have that $\alpha_e(I)$ is closed in $\frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e}$ hence $\alpha_e(f) \in \alpha_e(I)$. But this is true for each e hence

$$K_n f \subset I + \mathfrak{m}^e$$

for any e which implies, for the previous lemma that $f \in I$. □

Corollary C.0.14. *All the ideal of K_n are closed in the direct limit bornology induced by the direct limit $K_n = \varinjlim B_\rho$.*

Proof. For the direct limit bornology all the maps

$$K_n \to \frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e}$$

for $e \geqslant 1$ are bounded. Hence this bornology must be finer the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness, hence all closed subspaces for the latter are closed for former by proposition 2.1.43. □

Corollary C.0.15. *For any ideal $I \subset K_n$ the ideal $I \cap B_\rho$ is closed in B_ρ.*

Proof. We have the canonical injection $\phi_\rho : B_\rho \hookrightarrow K_n$ is a bounded map, hence

$$\phi_\rho^{-1}(I) = I \cap B_\rho$$

is a closed set in B_ρ. □

Proposition C.0.16. *Let $\mathfrak{m} \subset K_n$ denote the maximal ideal of K_n. Then, the coefficientwise boundedness bornology is the weakest for which all the projections*

$$\alpha_e : K_n \to \frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e}$$

for $e \geqslant 1$ are bounded.

Proof. We have the isomorphim

$$\frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e} \cong \left\{ \sum_{|i|<e} a_i X^i \in K_n \right\} \cong k^{\binom{n+e-1}{e-1}}$$

of bornological vector spaces, where the finite dimensional $k^{\binom{n+e-1}{e-1}}$ is equipped with the quotient bornology, which coincides with the product bornology. Suppose that K_n is equipped with a bornology such that all α_e are bounded, then there exists a unique bounded map $K_n \to k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$ which makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_n & \longrightarrow & k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!] \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha_e} & & \downarrow \\ \frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \frac{k[\![X_1,...,X_n]\!]}{(X_1,...,X_n)^e} \end{array}$$

commutative. This map is necessarily the injection $K_n \hookrightarrow k[\![X_1, ..., X_n]\!]$. So it must factor through the induced bornology on K_n, hence K_n is the weakest one for which α_e are bounded. □

We notice that algebraically $K_n \cong \mathcal{O}_{k^n,0}$, the ring of germs of analytic functions on $0 \in k^n$ when $k = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ and is isomorphic to it's rigid counterpart if k is non-archimedean. Moreover, given any $x \in k^n$ we can consider a neighborhood basis of x by polydisks and obtain $K_n(x) \cong \mathcal{O}_{k^n,x}$ as a direct limit of k-Banach algebras as above. We call $K_n(x)$ the n-dimensional k-Stellen algebra over x. So, it's clear that $K_n \cong K_n(x)$ and hence we can put on $K_n(x)$ the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness induced by that isomorphim. Therefore we have the following:

Proposition C.0.17. *Any ideal of $K_n(x)$ is closed for the bornology of coefficientwise boundedness and this bornology is the smallest for which the maps*

$$\alpha_e : K_n(x) \to \frac{K_n(x)}{\mathfrak{m}_x^e}$$

are all bounded, where $\mathfrak{m}_x$ is the maximal ideal of $K_n(x)$.

Proof. We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_n & \longrightarrow & \frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K_n(x) & \longrightarrow & \frac{K_n(x)}{\mathfrak{m}_x^e} \end{array}$$

where $\frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e} \to \frac{K_n(x)}{\mathfrak{m}_x^e}$ is an isomorphism of bornological vector spaces since is an algebraic isomorphim of finite dimensional vector spaces equipped with the canonical bornology. Hence to give the morphism $K_n(x) \to \frac{K_n(x)}{\mathfrak{m}_x^e}$ is equivalent to give the morphism $K_n \to \frac{K_n}{\mathfrak{m}^e}$ and "translate" it to x. □

Bibliography

[1] Nicolas Bourbaki *Espaces Vectoriels Topologiques*, Masson, 1981, Paris

[2] Alexander Grothendieck, *Topological vector spaces*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1973, London

[3] Helmut H. Schaefer, *Topological vector spaces*, Graduate Text in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 1970

[4] Gottfried Khöte, *Topological vector spaces I*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1973

[5] Gottfried Khöte, *Die Gleichungstheorie im Hilbertschem Raum*, 1936, Math. Z., 41, 153-162

[6] C. Perez-Garcia and W. H. Schikhof, *Locally convex spaces over non-archimedean valued fields*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, 2010

[7] Dietmar Vogt, *Regularity properties of LF-spaces*, Progress in functional analysis (Peniscola, 1990), North-Holland Math. Stud., 1992, 170, 57-84, Amsterdam

[8] P. Perez Carrera and J. Bonet, *Barrelled locally convex spaces*, North-Holland mathematics studies, 131, 1987

[9] Hans Grauert and Reinhold Remmert, *Analytische Stellenalgebren*, Springer-Verlag, 1971

[10] Helmut Goldmann, *Uniform Frechét Algebras*, North-Holland mathematics studies, 162, 1990

[11] Anastasios Mallios, *Topological Algebras. Selected Topics*, North-Holland mathematics studies, 124, 1984

[12] L. Van Hove, *Topologie des espaces fonctionnels analytiques et des groupes infinis de transformations*, Bulletin de la classe des sciences, Academie Royale de Belgique, 5° serie, 38, 1952, 333-351

[13] M. Akkar and C. Nacir, *Sur la vaquité du spectre d'une élemént d'une algébre LF*, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica, 2, 13, 1995, 85-96

[14] Walter Rudin, *Function theory in polydiscs*, W. A. Benjamin, INC, 1969

[15] Hans Grauert and Reinhold Remmert, *Theory of Stein spaces*, Springer-Verlag, 1979, New York

[16] O. Forster, *Zur theorie der Steinschen Algebren und Modulun*, Math. Z., 97, 1967, 367-405

[17] Jacques Frisch, *Point de platitude d'un morphisme d'espaces analityques complexes*, Inventiones math., 1967

[18] H. G. Dales, *The ring of holomorphic functions on a Stein compact set as a unique factorization domain*, Proceedings of the american mathematical society, 44, 1, 1974

[19] Christian Houzel, *Séminaire Banach*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 277, 1972

[20] Christian Houzel, *Espaces analytiques relatifs et théorème de finitude*, 1973, Math. Ann., 205, 13-54

[21] Fabienne Prosmans and Jean-Pierre Schneiders, *A homological study of bornological spaces*, December 2000, Prépublications Mathématiques de l'Université Paris 13, 46

[22] , Henri Hogbe-Nlend, *Bornologies and functional analysis*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 277, 1972

[23] , F. Gach, *A note on closed graph theorems*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenianae

[24] , V. B. Moscatelli, *Note on the Hahn-Banach problem in bornology*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society, s2-6, 1973

[25] John Tate, *Rigid analytic spaces*, 1971, Inventiones Math., 12, 257-289

[26] Siegfried Bosch and Ulrich Günzer and Reinhold Remmert, *Non-archimedean analysis*, Springer-Verlag, 1984

[27] Vladimir Berkovich, *Integration of one-forms on p-adic analytic spaces*, 2004

[28] Vladimir Berkovich, *Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, 33, 1990

[29] Vladimir Berkovich, *Vanishing cycles for non-archimedean analytic spaces*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, 9, 4, October 1996

[30] , Vladimir Berkovich, *Étale cohomology over non-archimedean analytic spaces*, Publication matematiques de l'I.H.E.S., 78, 5-161, 1993

[31] Michael Temkin, *A new proof of the Gerritzen-Grauert theorem*, Math. Ann., 44, 2005, 261-269

[32] Michael Temkin, *On local properties of non-archimedean analytic spaces*, Math. Ann., 318, 3, 2000, 585-607

[33] Elmar Grosse-Klönne, *Rigid analytic spaces with overconvergent structure sheaf*, 2000, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik, 73-95

[34] Brian Conrad, *Relative ampleness in rigid geometry*, 2006, Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble

[35] F. Baldassarri and K. S. Kedlaya, *De Rham cohomology of connections on non-archimedean curves*, 2013, Preprint

[36] Siegried Bosch, *Lectures on Formal and Rigid Geometry*, 2008,

[37] M. van der Put, *Serre duality for rigid analytic spaces*, 1992, Indag. math., N.S. 3(2), 219-235

[38] Bruno Chiarellotto, *Duality in rigid analysis*, 1990, Lecture notes in Mathematics, 1454, 142-172

[39] Peter Beyer, *On Serre-Duality for coherent sheaves on rigid-analytic spaces*, 1997, Manuscr. Math., 93, 219-245

[40] Pierre Berthelot, *Cohomologie rigide et cohomologie rigide a support propre*

[41] R. Huber, *Continuous valuations*, 1993, Math. Z., 212, 455-477

[42] Jean-Pierre Schneiders, *Quasi-Abelian Categories and Sheavess*, 1998, Préublications Mathématiques de l'Université Paris-Nord

[43] M. Artin and A. Grothendieck and J.L. Verdier, *Théorie des Topos et Cohomologie Etale des Schémas*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 269, 1972

[44] Jean Dieudonné, *Topics in local algebra*, Notre Dame Mathematical Lectures, University of Notre Dame, 10, 1967

[45] Nikolai Durov, *New Approach to Arakelov Geometry*, Ph.D. thesis, International Max Planck Research School for Moduli Spaces and their applications, 2008, http://arxiv.org/pdf/0704.2030.pdf

[46] Javier Fresán, *Compactification projective de Spec* $\mathbb{Z}$ *(d'aprés Durov)*, 2009, http://arxiv.org/pdf/0908.4059.pdf

[47] Frederic Paugam, *Global analytic geometry*, 2009, http://arxiv.org/pdf/0803.0148v3.pdf

[48] A.H. Stone, *Inverse limit of compact spaces*, General Topology and its Applications, 10, 203-211, North Holland Publishing Company, 1979

[49] P. Gabriel and M. Zisman, *Calculus of fractions and homotopy theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Springer, 35, 1967

[50] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Text in Mathematics, Springer, 52, 1977

[51] The Stack Project, *Pro-Étale Cohomology*, Chapter 46

[52] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Lie algebras and Lie groups*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer, 1500, 1992